BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

THE GIFT OF

Russell N. Bellows

THE

CHRISTIAN PIONEER:

INTENDED TO UPHOLD

THE GREAT DOCTRINES

OF

THE REFORMATION;

THE SUFFICIENCY OF SCRIPTURE,

THE RIGHT OF INDIVIDUAL JUDGMENT,

AND OF FEARLESS FREE INQUIRY.

"Every plant which my heavenly Father hath not planted, shall be rooted up."—JESUS.

"The night is far spent, the day is at hand; let us therefore cast off the works of darkness, and let us put on the armour of light."—PAUL.

VOL. III.

SEPTEMBER, 1828—AUGUST, 1829.

Glasgow,

PRINTED BY JAMES HEDDERWICK AND SON:

AND SOLD BY THE BOOKSELLERS IN GLASGOW AND EDINBURGH;

R. HUNTER, AND TEULON AND FOX, LONDON;

WILLIAM BROWNE, BRISTOL; EDWARD WILLMER, LIVERPOOL;

J. BELCHER, AND J. ALLEN, BIRMINGHAM;

JOHN HODGSON, BELFAST; KING AND RIDINGS, CORK;

B. BATES, NEW-YORK; AND LEONARD C. BOWLES, BOSTON, AMERICA.

X288.4
C839
v.3

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

PAGES

Aspland, Rev. R. Letter to, by Charles Butler, Esq. 1
Anniversaries of Meeting Houses.
Greengate, Salford, ... 148–213
Glasgow, ... 203
Arian View of John i. 1–14. 341
America, Unitarianism in, ... 35–69–73–143
Quaker Unitarians of, ... 69
Beard, Rev. J. R. Summary of the Controversy between, and Rev. R. Taylor, ... 89
Butler, Charles, Esq. Letter from, to the Rev. R. Aspland, ... 1
Canada, Upper, Letter from, ... 10
Unitarianism in, ... 73
Channing, Dr. Sermon at Boston, ... 3–44
Additional Remarks on the Character of Napoleon, 16–115
Discourse in Rhode Island, ... 195–221–271
On the Character and Writings of Fenelon, 359–389–421
Character, On Decision of, ... 232–268
Christ, On the two Natures in, ... 185
Christianity, Reflections on the Principles and Evidences of,
Letter, I. 77
II. 120
III. 167
IV. 190
V. 239
VI. 264
VII. 344
VIII. 384
IX. 413
Church Establishments, ... 298–329
Co-operative System, On the, ... 314–399
Catholic Emancipation, ... 255–287–323

39

PAGES

Dialogues on Religion, No. 1, ... 149
2, ... 226
3, ... 278
4, ... 349–380

Detector, The, No. 1, ... 367
Edinburgh Christian Instructor, ... 370
Rev. Dr. Wardlaw, ... 374
Rev. William Thomson, ... 375

Editor, Notes by the, ... 1–38–108–139–319–359

Edinburgh Bible Society, Remarks on, ... 51–85

Expurgatorial Committee of the Synod of Ulster, ... 183

England and Rome, Churches of, Comparison between the, ... 257

Essay on the Reading, the Translation, and the Import of Prov. xiv. 10, ... 377

Fenelon, Dr. Channing, on the Character and Writings of, ... 359–389–421

Funeral Sermons, ... 341

Family Use, Sermons for, ... 75–328

Glasgow Petitions for Universal Religious Liberty, ... 255–287

Glasgow Unitarian Congregation, ... 36–327
Anniversary of, ... 203

Integrity, Religious, The Editor's Remarks on, ... 139

Inglis, Rev. David, of Port-Glasgow, Letter to the, ... 245

Letters from
Charles Butler, Esq. to Rev. R. Aspland, ... 1
Upper Canada, ... 10
Rev. J. Yates, on Dr. Wardlaw's Volume, ... 37
Dr. Wardlaw in Reply, ... 96
G. B. to a small Unitarian Congregation, ... 128–307–333
G. C. S. on the Character of Dr. Parr, ... 134
Dr. Parr, to the Archbishop of Dublin, ... 136
Mr. Yates in Answer to Dr. Wardlaw, ... 159
Andrew Proctor to the Rev. David Inglis, ... 245
Dr. Wardlaw in Reply to Mr. Yates, ... 302
A Protestant Dissenter to Rev. William Thorpe, ... 319

Methodist Schism, and Methodist Persecution, ... 65

Methodists, The Protestant, ... 311

Notes on Passages of Scripture, ... 55–236

Obstacles to the Spread of Unitarianism, ... 293

Parr, Dr. Review of Field's Memoirs of, ... 62–105
G. C. S. On the Character of, ... 134
Letter from, to Dr. Magee, ... 136

PAGES

Parr, Dr. Editor's Remarks on, and on Religious Integrity,.....139

Pioneer, The Christian,

Annual Meeting of the Unitarian Ministers of Lancashire and Cheshire,..... 22

Service of Plate given to Rev. H. Montgomery,..... 29

Resolutions passed at the Annual Meeting of the Kent and Sussex Unitarian Association,..... 33

Annual Meeting of the South Wales Unitarian Society,..... 34

The British Indian Unitarian Association,..... 34

Unitarianism in America,..... 35

Glasgow Unitarian Chapel,.....36–327

Methodist Schism, and Methodist Persecution,..... 65

American Unitarian Quakers,..... 69

British and Foreign Unitarian Association,.....70–404

American Unitarian Association,.....73–143

Unitarianism in Canada,..... 73

British Society for Promoting the Religious Principles of the Reformation,..... 74

Sermons for Family Use,.....75–328

Unitarian Mission in Lancashire and Cheshire,.....148

Greengate Chapel, Salford, Anniversary,.....148–213

Catholic Liberality, Episcopalian Benevolence, Presbyterian Intolerance, Methodist Bigotry,.....218

Revivals in Wales,.....249

Catholic Meeting of the County of Antrim,.....251

Catholic Emancipation,.....255–287–323

Dr. Chalmers' Speech at Edinburgh,.....290

Poetry.

The Cherries,.....212

Sonnet,.....249

Review,

Field's Memoirs of Dr. Parr,.....62–105

Michaelis on the Burial and Resurrection of Jesus Christ,..108

Taylor's Process of Historical Proof exemplified,.....179

Library of Entertaining Knowledge,.....354

Religion, Dialogues on, No. 1,.....149

2,.....226

3,.....278

4,.....349–380

Religious Liberty,..... 1

Glasgow Petitions in favour of,.....255–287

PAGES

Religious Integrity, The Editor's Remarks on, ... 139
Scripture, Notes on Passages of, ... 55–239
SIGNATURES OF CORRESPONDENTS.
Christopher Dunlop, ... 11
Γαμμα, ... 16–105–179–287–340
James Yates, ... 43–167
V. 55–89
N. 58–239–379
G. C. S. 61–64–70–85–108–112–115–128–136–183–298–313–327–341–359
Homo, ... 80–123–173–194–244–268–349–388
Ralph Wardlaw, ... 100–307
G. B. 134–311–338
D. S. 189
Robert Hedderwick, ... 203
K. 236
Andrew Proctor, ... 245
T. M. 249
P. H. 271
Zaccheus, ... 301–333
Barnabas, ... 318–404
Erasmus, ... 344
Argus, ... 376
Thorpe, Rev. William, of Bristol, Letter to the, ... 319
Trinitarianism Self-condemned, ... 113
Ulster, Synod of, Expurgatorial Committee of the, ... 183
Annual Meeting of, at Lurgan, ... 430
UNITARIAN ASSOCIATIONS.
Lancashire and Cheshire, ... 22
Kent and Sussex, ... 33
South Wales, ... 34
British Indian, ... 34
British and Foreign, ... 70–404
American, ... 73–143
Unitarian, The, No. 1, ... 12
2, ... 100
3, ... 173
4, ... 283–338
Unitarian Worthies, No. 4, Theophilus Lindsey, ... 58–80
5, Firmin Abauzit, ... 123

PAGES

Unitarian Congregation, Letters to, by their former Minister,
Letter 1,.....128
2,.....307–333
Unitarianism, On the Obstacles to the Spread of,.....293
Wales, Religious Revivals in,.....249
Wardlaw, Rev. Dr. Letter in reply to Rev. J. Yates,..... 96
Reply to Mr. Yates' Answer, ...302
Yates, Rev. James, Remarks by, on Dr. Wardlaw's Work,..... 37
Reply to Dr. Wardlaw's Answer,.....159

THE

CHRISTIAN PIONEER.

No. 25. SEPTEMBER, 1828. Vol. III.

Universal Religious Freedom.

[WE had intended closing our Second Volume with the following Letter, but in consequence of the important proceedings in the Synod of Ulster, together with other subjects, we were unable to accomplish our wishes. The letter is from Charles Butler, Esq. of Lincoln's Inn, a leading and venerable member of the Roman Catholic communion. It breathes the spirit of pure Christian benevolence, of universal religious freedom. From such men, what can the Protestant world have to fear? Such a spirit it would be well, were Protestants of all denominations to imbibe—such a mind, it would advance the progress of mankind, would they all attempt to equal. The letter was written the day after the public festival in commemoration of the Repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts.—*Ed.*]

To the Rev. Robert Aspland, Protestant Dissenting Minister at Hackney.

DEAR SIR,

I have often corresponded with you, but never had the pleasure of seeing you till yesterday, at the dinner to celebrate the Repeal of the Sacramental Test.

This dinner I shall never forget. The speeches pronounced at it on civil and religious liberty—the power of argument—the impressive appeals to the heart—the noble sentiments of true Christianity—and above all, the generous feelings towards the Roman Catholics, with which they abounded—will never escape my memory or my gratitude.

You were pre-eminently great. I hung on every word you spoke. When you mentioned with so much sympathy the poor Roman Catholics who have suffered for conscientious scruples, I was lost in admiration of your real liberality, your nobleness of mind, and fearless disdain of prejudice. May my country abound with such as you! This, assuredly, is wishing her a great good.

I have advocated the Catholic cause since 1778, the year in which the first bill for the relief of the Catholics was brought into parliament. I had great pleasure yesterday in thinking that I had uniformly advocated it on principles applicable to the case of all religious dissidents from the Church of the State. Early in life I met with Mr. Locke's first Letter on Toleration, which, you know, comprises all that is to be found in his subsequent letters. His doctrine of religious liberty became mine, and I have undeviatingly adhered to it. The sanguinary code of Queen Elizabeth, the Court of High Commission, the Episcopalian persecutions in Scotland, the ejection of the Presbyterian ministers by the Act of Uniformity, the proceedings in Oates's plot, and the scanty measure of religious liberty doled out in the Act of Toleration, I have frequently and loudly lamented and reprobated. As frequently and loudly have I lamented and reprobated the Inquisition, the Marian persecution, the massacre on St. Bartholomew's day, the revocation of the edict of Nantes, the expatriation of the Jews and Moriscoes from Spain, and the niggard toleration yet shown to Protestants in some Catholic countries on the continent. I perfectly agree with Father Persons (in his *Judgment of a Catholic Englishman*), that "neither breathing nor the use of common air, is more due unto man, or common to all, than ought to be the liberty of conscience to Christian men; whereby one liveth to God, and to himself; and without which he struggleth with the torment of a continued lingering death."

In my "History of the English Catholics," I have recorded Mr. Fox's having said to me, that "I should not meet with as many real friends to civil and religious liberty as I seemed to expect." What a stride has the glorious cause taken since his death! What a spring did it take yesterday! But never—never should our obligations to Mr. Fox be forgotten. He took up our cause while it lay shivering on the ground, and, to use the words of Gray,

"Ope'd its young eye to bear the blaze of greatness."

In fact, religious liberty was his favourite theme; and when he dwelt upon it, his periods rolled with more than his ordinary magnificence. How greatly did the nephew yesterday bring the uncle before all of us who remembered him! I have great pleasure to say, that when the Catholic Relief Bill was pending in 1791, Mr. Pitt exerted all his

powers in our cause. You know what favourites we were with Mr. Burke: how Mr. Wyndham spoke of us: that a wish for our emancipation was breathed in the last word uttered by Mr. Grattan. What men were these! How great is their authority!

I am sure, that yesterday, whenever the Duke of Wellington's great and glorious victory at Waterloo, and our hopes of him, were mentioned, it brought to your mind the oration for Marcellus, in which Cicero shows so admirably how greatly a general shares his triumphs with his officers and his soldiers, but that a deed of clemency is all his own. Should not his Grace—should not his Grace's friends—sometimes think of this?

I had the pleasure to sit next to our common friend, Dr. Thomas Rees. May God bless you both! Though we now pray in different churches, may we—may all that joined us yesterday—meet in the tabernacles of heaven, and sing the praises of the Almighty, and bless his holy name through all eternity!

Excuse my taking this liberty, and believe me, with the most heartful thanks to you and your friends, for your celestial deeds of yesterday, your and their most obliged and most obedient Servant,

Lincoln's Inn, June 19. CHARLES BUTLER.

"A Discourse delivered at the Installation of the Rev. Mellish Irving Motte, as Pastor of the South Congregational Society in Boston, May 21, 1828.—*By William Ellery Channing, D. D."*

---

2 Tim. i. 7.—"For God hath not given us the spirit of fear; but of power, and of love, and of a sound mind."

WHY was Christianity given? Why did Christ seal it with his blood? Why is it to be preached? What is the great happiness it confers? What is the chief blessing for which it is to be prized? What is its pre-eminent glory—its first claim on the gratitude of mankind? These are great questions. I wish to answer them plainly, according to the light and ability which God has given me. I read the answer to them in the text. There I learn the great good which God confers through Jesus Christ. "He hath given us not the spirit of fear, but of power, and of

love, and of a sound mind." The glory of Christianity, is, the pure and lofty action which it communicates to the human mind. It does not breathe a timid, abject spirit. If it did, it would deserve no praise. It gives power, energy, courage, constancy to the will; love, disinterestedness, enlarged affections to the heart; soundness, clearness, and vigour to the understanding. It rescues him who receives it, from sin—from the sway of the passions; gives him the full and free use of his best powers; brings out and brightens the divine image in which he was created; and in this way not only bestows the promise, but the beginning of heaven. This is the excellence of Christianity.

This subject I propose to illustrate. Let me begin it with one remark, which I would willingly avoid, but which seems to me to be demanded by the circumstances in which I am placed. I beg you to remember, that in this discourse I speak in my own name, and in no other. I am not giving you the opinions of any sect or body of men, but my own. I hold myself alone responsible for what I utter. Let none listen to me for the purpose of learning what others think. I indeed belong to that class of Christians, who are distinguished, by believing that there is One God, even the Father, and that Jesus Christ is not this one God, but his dependent and obedient Son. But my accordance with these is far from being universal, nor have I any desire to extend it. What other men believe, is to me of little moment. Their arguments I gratefully hear. Their conclusions I am free to receive or reject. I have no anxiety to wear the livery of any party. I indeed take cheerfully the name of a Unitarian, because unwearied efforts are used to raise against it a popular cry; and I have not so learned Christ, as to shrink from reproaches cast on what I deem his truth. Were the name more honoured, I should be glad to throw it off; for I fear the shackles which a party connexion imposes. I wish to regard myself as belonging, not to a sect, but to the community of free minds—of lovers of truth—of followers of Christ, both on earth and in heaven. I desire to escape the narrow walls of a particular church, and to stand under the open sky, in the broad light, looking far and wide, seeing with my own eyes, hearing with my own ears, and following truth meekly, but resolutely, however arduous or solitary be the path in which she leads. I am, then, no organ of a sect, but speak for myself alone; and I

thank God that I live at a time, and under circumstances, which make it my duty to lay open my whole mind with freedom and simplicity.

I began with asking, What is the main design and glory of Christianity? and I repeat the answer, that its design is to give, not a spirit of fear, but of power, of love, and of a sound mind. In this its glory chiefly consists. In other words, *the influence which it is intended to exert on the human mind,* constitutes its supreme honour and happiness. Christ is a great Saviour, as he redeems or sets free the mind, cleansing it from evil, breathing into it the love of virtue, calling forth its noblest faculties and affections, enduing it with moral power, restoring it to order, health, and liberty. Such was his great aim. To illustrate these views will be the object of the present discourse.

In reading the New Testament, I everywhere meet the end here ascribed to Jesus Christ. He came, as I am there taught, not to be an outward, but inward deliverer; not to rear an outward throne, but to establish his kingdom within us. He came, according to the express language and plain import of the sacred writers, *to save us from sin, to bless us by turning us from our iniquities, to redeem us* from corruptions *handed down by tradition,* to form *a glorious and spotless church* or community, *to create us anew after the image of God,* to make us *by his promises partakers of a divine nature,* and to give us pardon and heaven, by calling us to repentance and a growing virtue. In reading the New Testament, I everywhere learn, that Christ lived, taught, died, and rose again, *to exert a purifying and ennobling influence on the human character;* to make us victorious over sin, over ourselves, over peril and pain; to join us to God by filial love, and and above all, by likeness of nature, by participation of his spirit. This is plainly laid down in the New Testament as the supreme end of Christ.

Let me now ask, Can a nobler end be ascribed to Jesus? I affirm, that there is, and can be, no greater work on earth, than to purify the soul from evil, and to kindle in it new light, life, energy, and love. I maintain, that the true measure of the glory of a religion, is to be found in the spirit and power which it communicates to its disciples. This is one of the plain teachings of reason. The chief blessing to an intelligent being, that which makes all other

blessings poor, is the improvement of his own mind. Man is glorious and happy, not by what he has, but by what he *is*. He can receive nothing better or nobler than the unfolding of his own spiritual nature. The highest existence in the universe is Mind; for God is mind; and the developement of that principle which assimilates us to God, must be our supreme good. The omnipotent Creator, we have reason to think, can bestow nothing greater than intelligence, love, rectitude, energy of will and of benevolent action; for these are the splendours of his own nature. We adore him for these. In imparting these, he imparts, as it were, himself. We are too apt to look abroad for good. But the only true good is within. In this outward universe, magnificent as it is in the bright day and the starry night—in the earth and the skies, we can discover nothing so vast as thought, so strong as the unconquerable purpose of duty, so sublime as the spirit of disinterestedness and self-sacrifice. A mind, which withstands all the powers of the outward universe, all the pains which fire, and sword, and storm can inflict, rather than swerve from uprightness, is nobler than the universe. Why will we not learn the glory of the soul? We are seeking a foreign good. But we all possess within us what is of more worth than the external creation. For this outward system is the product of Mind. All its harmony, beauty, and beneficent influences, are the fruits and manifestations of Thought and Love; and is it not nobler and happier, to be enriched with these energies, from which the universe springs, and to which it owes its magnificence, than to possess the universe itself? It is not what we have, but what we *are*, which constitutes our glory and felicity. The only true and durable riches belong to the mind. A soul, narrow and debased, may extend its possessions to the end of the earth, but is poor and wretched still. It is through inward health that we enjoy all outward things. Philosophers teach us, that the mind creates the beauty which it admires in nature; and we all know, that when abandoned to evil passions, it can blot out this beauty, and spread over the fairest scenes the gloom of a dungeon. We all know, that by vice it can turn the cup of social happiness into poison, and the most prosperous condition of life into a curse. From these views we learn, that the true friend and Saviour, is not he who acts for us abroad, but who acts within, who

sets the soul free, touches the springs of thought and affection, binds us to God, and by assimilating us to the Creator, brings us into harmony with the creation. Thus the end which we have ascribed to Christ, is the most glorious and beneficent which can be accomplished by any power on earth or in heaven.

That the highest purpose of Christianity is such as has now been affirmed, might easily be shown from a survey of all its doctrines and precepts. It might be shown, that every office with which Jesus Christ is invested, was intended to give him power over the human character; and that his great distinction consists in the grandeur and beneficence of his influence on the soul. But a discussion of this extent cannot be comprehended in a single discourse. Instead of a general survey of the subject, I shall take one feature of it, a primary and most important one, and shall attempt to show that the great aim of this, is to call forth the soul to a higher life—to a nobler exercise of its power and affections.

This leading feature of Christianity, is the knowledge which it gives of the character of God. Jesus Christ came to reveal the Father. In the prophecies concerning him in the Old Testament, no characteristic is so frequently named, as that he should spread the knowledge of the true God. Now I ask, what constitutes the importance of such a revelation? Why has the Creator sent his Son to make himself known? I answer, God is most worthy to be known, because he is the most quickening, purifying, and ennobling object for the mind; and his great purpose in revealing himself, is, that he may exalt and perfect human nature. God, as he is manifested by Christ, is another name for intellectual and moral excellence; and in the knowledge of him, our intellectual and moral powers find their element, nutriment, strength, expansion, and happiness. To know God, is to attain to the sublimest conception in the universe. To love God, is to bind ourselves to a being, who is fitted, as no other being is, to penetrate and move our whole hearts; in loving whom, we exalt ourselves—in loving whom, we love the great, the good, the beautiful, and the infinite; and under whose influence, the soul unfolds itself as a perennial plant under the cherishing sun. This constitutes the chief glory of religion. It ennobles the soul. In this its unrivalled dignity and happiness consist.

I fear that the world at large think religion a very different thing from what has now been set forth. Too many think it a depressing, rather than an elevating service—that it breaks rather than ennobles the spirit—that it teaches us to cower before an almighty and irresistible being; and I must confess, that religion, as it has been generally taught, is any thing but an elevating principle. It has been used to scare the child, and appal the adult. Men have been virtually taught to glorify God by flattery, rather than by becoming excellent and glorious themselves, and thus doing honour to their Maker. Our dependence on God has been so taught, as to extinguish the consciousness of our free nature and moral power. Religion, in one or another form, has always been an engine for crushing the human soul. But such is not the religion of Christ. If it were, it would deserve no respect. We are not, we cannot be bound to prostrate ourselves before a deity, who makes us abject and base. That moral principle within us, which calls us to watch over and to perfect our own souls, is an inspiration which no teaching can supersede or abolish. But I cannot bear, even in way of argument, to speak of Christianity as giving views of God depressing and debasing to the human mind. Christ hath revealed to us God as The Father, and as a Father in the noblest sense of that word. He hath revealed him, as the author and lover of all souls, desiring to redeem all from sin, and to impress his likeness more and more resplendently on all; as proffering to all that best gift in the universe, his "holy spirit;" as having sent his beloved Son to train us up, and to introduce us to an "inheritance, incorruptible, undefiled, and unfading in the heavens." Such is the God of Jesus Christ—a being not to break the spirit, but to breathe trust, courage, constancy, magnanimity; in a word, all the sentiments which form an elevated mind.

This sentiment, that the knowledge of God, as given by Christ, is important and glorious, because quickening and exalting to the human soul, needs to be taught plainly and forcibly. The main ground of the obligation of being religious, I fear, is not understood among the multitude of Christians. Ask them, why they must know and worship God?—and I fear, that were the heart to speak, the answer would be: Because he can do with us what he will, and, consequently, our first concern is to secure his favour. Religion is a calculation of interest—a means of

safety. God is worshipped too often on the same principle on which flattery and personal attentions are lavished on human superiors; and the worshipper cares not how abjectly he bows, if he may win to his side the power which he cannot resist. I look with deep sorrow on this common perversion of the highest principle of the soul. My friends, God is not to be worshipped, because he has much to give; for, on this principle, a despot, who should be munificent to his slaves, would merit homage. He is not to be adored for mere power; for power, when joined with selfishness and crime, ought to be withstood, and the greater the might of an evil agent, the holier and the loftier is the spirit which will not bend to him. True religion is the worship of a perfect being, who is the author of perfection to those who adore him. On this ground, and on no other, religion rests.

Why is it, my hearers, that God has discovered such solicitude, if I may use the word, to make himself known, and obtain our worship? Think you, that he calls us to adore him, from a love of homage or service? Has God man's passion for ruling—man's thirst for applause—man's desire to have his name shouted by crowds? Could the acclamations of the universe, though concentrated into one burst of praise, give our Creator a new or brighter consciousness of his own majesty and goodness? Oh! no. He has manifested himself to us, because, in the knowledge and adoration of his perfections, our own intellectual and moral perfection is found. What he desires, is, not our subjection, but our excellence. He has no love of praise. He calls us as truly to honour goodness in others as in himself, and only claims supreme honour, because he transcends all others, and because he communicates to the mind which receives him, a light, strength, purity, which no other being can confer. God has no love of empire. It could give him no pleasure to have his footstool worn by the knees of infinite hosts. It is to make us his children, in the highest sense of that word—to make us more and more the partakers of his own nature, not to multiply slaves, that he hath sent his Son to make himself known. God, indeed, is said to seek his own glory; but the glory of a creator must consist in the glory of his works; and we may be assured, that he cannot wish any recognition of himself, but that which will perfect his noblest, highest work, the immortal mind.

Do not, my friends, forget the great end for which Christ enjoins on us the worship of God. It is not, that we may ingratiate ourselves with an almighty agent, whose frown is destruction. It is, that we may hold communion with an intelligence and goodness, infinitely surpassing our own; that we may rise above imperfect and finite natures; that we may attach ourselves by love and reverence to the best Being in the universe; and that, through veneration and love, we may receive into our own minds the excellence, disinterestedness, wisdom, purity, and power, which we adore. This reception of the divine attributes, I desire especially to hold forth, as the most glorious end for which God reveals himself. To praise him, is not enough. That homage, which has no power to assimilate us to him, is of little or no worth. The truest admiration, is, that by which we receive other minds into our own. True praise is a sympathy with excellence, gaining strength by utterance. Such is the praise which God demands. Then only is the purpose of Christ's revelation of God accomplished, when, by reception of the doctrine of a Paternal Divinity, we are quickened to "follow him, as dear children," and are "filled with his fulness," and become "his temples," and "dwell in God, and have God dwelling in ourselves."

(To be Continued.)

To the Editor of the Christian Pioneer.

Dear Sir,

Having lately received a letter from our old friend William Lambie of Upper Canada, I thought some parts of it would be suitable for the Pioneer. If you are of the same opinion, they are much at your service. For my own part, I was gratified in learning, that Unitarianism had other advocates in Canada than our friend, and that it had been defended even in the Provincial Assembly. May we not hope soon to hear of the establishment of "The Canadian Unitarian Association" corresponding with the British and American? We are apt to associate with Canada, the idea of rudeness, inconvenience, ignorance, and solitude; this letter tends to correct this notion, and places them in a rapidly improving light. I doubt not but many will feel as I did on its perusal.

In the Montreal Herald of December 29, 1827, there is a spirited report of the second annual dinner of "The Dalhousie St. Andrews Philanthropic Society." All persons, Scotch or not, of a good moral character, are admitted. One object is to give relief to sick or old members and those having bodily infirmities. You can have a perusal of both the Herald and original letter, if wished.

Yours truly,

Paisley, 10th August, 1828. CHRISTOPHER DUNLOP.

(*Extracts.*)

Dalhousie, Upper Canada, April 28, 1828.

DEAR FRIEND,

Two years ago, it was proposed to institute a Scotch Society, and to have an annual dinner. I joined in the idea; the Society was formed, and called the "Dalhousie St. Andrew's Philanthropic Society." Our anniversary is held on the 30th of November. The last celebration was patronised by several gentlemen from Perth; and they were so well pleased with the Institution, that they proposed we should erect a Hall for the Society to meet in. Conceiving that this would be a public benefit, I heartily seconded the suggestion, and a liberal subscription took place. The Hall is in a state of forwardness, and will be ready by November, 1828; it is 32 by 22 feet inside, and will be handsomely done off. From this sprung the idea of a Public Library, which is in progress, and will soon be open for the members, &c.

Numbers here-about associate in Clubs, and get the Montreal Herald, so that we can talk still on Trade and Politics as formerly. In a short time, a Newspaper will be commenced in Perth, to be called *The Independent Examiner;* and from the known abilities of the Editor, I expect it will be a good one.

Seldom a Sunday passes, but we have an opportunity of hearing preaching, either by a Dr. Gemmell of the good old Cameronian faith, or by the Methodists. I sometimes have a little skirmishing with them. To be sure I hold, as they think, some capital errors; but they admit I am "a *gabby chap,*" and express pity, that such knowledge should be so ill applied. I understand I have the benefit of their prayers.

I now have a few here and there who seem to think

Unitarianism the most reasonable and scriptural doctrine; but as yet, I find none who would take up the cross along with me. Never did I desire more to have a Sunday meeting on the Paisley plan*; nor am I altogether hopeless. My opponents, I think, are not quite so bigotted as at the first, and I hope liberality of sentiment will prevail.

I know, from a discussion which took place in the Provincial Parliament, that Unitarian Societies do exist in Upper Canada. On a debate on what was called the "*Religious Society Relief Bill*," a Captain Mathews took occasion to prove that Unitarians were the only true Christians; and, in a long speech, went into detail on the subject of the Unity, from the Old Testament—thence, to the New. That it was what Jesus and his apostles taught—that it was the doctrine of the primitive Church—traced its corruption, and how the doctrine of the Trinity came to be so universally received—finally, he declared himself a firm Unitarian—that he believed what was Christ and his Apostles' doctrine on the subject, and no other.

So that you see, even here our principles are making their way, as well as in the Imperial Parliament, where I rejoiced to see a decided majority for the Repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts.

A new Parliament will be chosen this summer, and if Captain Mathews is re-elected, I shall try to get into correspondence with him.

I am anxious to hear from you all, and hope to be gratified soon. Meantime you all have my best wishes and prayers.—Your affectionate friend,

WILLIAM LAMBIE.

The Unitarian.—No. I.

THE unity and absolute supremacy of Jehovah, is the grand—the distinguishing doctrine of the Scriptures: there is not a book—there is scarcely a chapter, either in the Old or New Testament, which does not contain the most striking passages in confirmation of it—passages, the force of which, one would think, must be irresistible, and bring full conviction to every mind. The following are a few of the passages from the Old Testament:—"Hear, O

* Paisley Unitarian Church plan of conducting public worship, &c.—*Ed.*

Israel; Jehovah our God is one Jehovah"—Deut. vi. 4. "That thou mightest know that Jehovah He is God; there is none else beside him"—Deut. iv. 35. "For who is God save Jehovah? or who is a rock, save our God?"—2 Sam. xxii. 32, and Psal. xviii. 31. "O Lord God of Israel, who dwellest between the cherubims, thou art God, even thou alone"—2 Kings xix. 15, and Isaiah xxxvii. 16. "O Lord God! there is none like thee, neither is there any God beside thee, according to all that we have heard with our ears"—2 Sam. vii. 22, and 1 Chron. xvii. 20. "Thus saith Jehovah, I am the first, and I am the last, and beside me there is no God. Is there a God beside me? Yea, there is no God, I know not any"—Isaiah xliv. 6 and 8. "I am Jehovah, and there is none else; there is no God beside me"—xlv. v. "There is no God else besides me; a just God, and a Saviour; there is none else beside me. Look unto me, and be saved, all ye ends of the earth; for I am God, and there is none else"—ver. 21 and 22. "I am God, and there is none else; I am God, and there is none like me"—xlvi. 9. "To whom then will ye liken me, or shall I be equal? saith the Holy One"—xl. 25. "In that day there shall be one Lord, and his name One"—Zech. xiv. 9. See also Gen. i. 1, 27, and 31; lv. 11. Exod. iii. 6; xiv. 15; xx. 3; xxii. 20; xxxiv. 14. Deut. iv. 39; v. 7; vi. 13 and 39; x. 17; xxxii. 9. 1 Kings xviii. 39. 2 Kings xix. 19. 2 Chron. ii. 5. Psal. xviii. 31; lxxvii. 13; lxxxiii. 18; lxxxvi. 9 and 10; lxxxix. 6; xcv. 3; xcvi. 4 and 5; c. 3; cxxxv. 5. Isaiah xxvi. 4; xxxvii. 20; xliii. 8; lvii. 15. Jer. xxx. 9; xxxii. 27. Hosea xiii. 4, &c.

The unity and absolute supremacy of Jehovah, then, is the doctrine of the Old Testament; for we find nothing there in contradiction to these clear and decisive passages. This was the doctrine which separated the Jews from the nations of the earth. They often disregarded the declarations, and disobeyed the commands of their God; but never to this day have they found a Trinity in their Scriptures (which some Christians have thought they have done); they have never conceived the idea, that their promised Messiah was to be their God: indeed, the doctrine of the Trinity, as held by the generality of modern Christians, is their principal, and in many cases their only, objection to Christianity.

Did, then, he who "came not to destroy, but to fulfil

the law," Jesus Christ, "the way, the truth, and the life," did he by his doctrines, his precepts, and example, annul, or did he confirm this doctrine of the Old Testament? Let us examine the account of his life and sayings, recorded by the four Evangelists: "And one of the Scribes came, and asked him, which is the first commandment of all? And Jesus answered him, The first of all the commandments, is, Hear, O Israel, Jehovah our God is one Jehovah; and thou shalt love Jehovah thy God, with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength: this is the first commandment." "And the Scribe said unto him, Well Master, thou hast said the truth, for there is one God, and there is none other but he." "And when Jesus saw that he had answered discreetly, he said unto him, Thou art not far from the kingdom of God"—Mark xii. 28 to 34. Were there no other passage but *this*, this alone would be sufficient evidence that Christ confirmed the doctrine of the Old Testament; since he has proclaimed the Unity and absolute Supremacy of Jehovah, in the very words of Moses, and has declared it to be the first of all the commandments. But this is *not* all; every page of the New Testament is filled with the same sublime doctrine. When praying to his Father, Jesus says, "This is life eternal, that they might knew thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent"—John xvii. 3. He has declared, speaking of the day of judgment, or, as some commentators think, of the precise time of the destruction of Jerusalem: "Of that day, and that hour, knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the *Son*, but the Father"—Mark xiii. 32, and Mat. xxiv. 36. When the Pharisee said unto him, "Good Master, what good thing shall I do, that I may have eternal life?" He answered, "Why callest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is, God"—Mat. xix. 16, 17, and Mark x. 18, 19. He answered the demon who temptingly told him to fall down and worship him, "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve" —Mat. iv. 10. He thus encourages his disciples when about to leave them, "If ye loved me, ye would rejoice, because I said, I go unto the Father: for my Father is greater than I"—John xiv. 28. And when the mother of James and John came to him and said, "Grant that these my two sons may sit, the one on thy right hand, the

other on thy left, in thy kingdom," he answered, "Ye know not what ye ask—to sit on my right hand and on my left, is not mine to give; but it shall be given to them for whom it is prepared of my Father"—Mat. xx. 21, 23. He said unto Mary after his resurrection, "Go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father, and your Father; and to my God, and your God"—John xx. 17. He constantly ascribed all his knowledge, his words, and his works, to his heavenly Father, and argues from *thence* the divinity of his mission. "I can of mine own self do nothing: as I hear, I judge: and my judgment is just; because I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father which hath sent me"—John v. 30. "My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me. If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself. He that speaketh of himself seeketh his own glory: but he that seeketh his glory that sent him, the same is true, and no unrighteousness is in him"—John vii. 16 to 18. "I do nothing of myself; but as my Father hath taught me, I speak these things. And he that sent me is with me: the Father hath not left me alone; for I do always those things that please him"—John viii. 28, 29. "But now ye seek to kill me, a man that hath told you the truth, which I have heard of God"—John viii. 40. "I have not spoken of myself; but the Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak. And I know that his commandment is life everlasting: whatsoever I speak therefore, even as the Father said unto me, so I speak"—John xii. 49, 50. "Now they have known that all things, whatsoever thou hast given me, are of thee: for I have given unto them the words which thou gavest me; and they have received them, and have known surely that I came out from thee, and they have believed that thou didst send me"—John xvii. 7, 8. He taught his disciples to pray to the Father only. "When ye pray, say, *Our Father* which art in heaven; hallowed be *thy* name. *Thy* kingdom come."—"For *thine* is the kingdom, &c."—Mat. vi. 9, &c. and Luke xi. 1 to 4. "But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the *Father* in spirit and in truth: for the Father seeketh such to worship him"—John iv. 23. "In that day ye shall ask *me* nothing. Verily, verily, I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall ask the *Father in my name*, he

will give it you"—John xvi. 23. And he himself set them the example. "I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth:" "even so, Father, for so it seemed good in thy sight"—Mat. xi. 25, 26, and Luke x. 21. "Father, I thank thee, that Thou hast heard me"—John xi. 41. "O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me: nevertheless, not as I will, but as thou wilt"—Mat. xxvi. 39 and 42. "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?"—Mat. xxvii. 46, and Mark xv. 34. "Father, into thine hands I commend my spirit"—Luke xxiii. 46. Read, too, the whole of the 17th chapter of John's Gospel, and then say, whether he that prayed thus, could be the very and eternal God. See, also, Mat. xxiii. 9, 10; vii. 21; x. 40; xi. 27; xii. 50; xiv. 23; xvi. 27; xxvi. 53; xxviii. 18, 19. Mark ix. 37. Luke x. 16; xxii. 29. John iii. 16 to 36; iv. 34; v. 19 to 43; vi. 38 to 40; viii. 42 to 54; ix. 4; x. 25 to 38; xi. 22 and 42; xii. 44: xiv. 10 to 31; xv. 16; xvi. 5; xviii. 11; xx. 21; xxvi. 27, &c. All these are the words of Jesus Christ himself, who surely would not have used such strong expressions, as the preceding passages contain, of his inferiority and submission to the Father, if he had been equal with him. In short, "If there be any meaning in human language—if there be any weight in the most solemn and repeated declarations—if there be any authority in the commands, or any force in the example of Jesus Christ, then it is, I think, a certain truth, that Jehovah alone, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, is the *only* God, the only proper object of religious worship."

I shall, in my next paper, produce the testimony of the Apostles to the Supremacy of Jehovah, and shall examine the doctrine of the Trinity as opposed to it. Γαμμα.

(To be Continued.)

Additional Remarks on the Character of Napoleon Bonaparte, by Dr. Channing of Boston, North America.

(Continued from Vol. II. page 412.)

We have spoken of the inferiority and worthlessness of that dominion over others, which has been coveted so greedily in all ages. We should rejoice could we convey some just idea of its moral turpitude. Of all injuries and crimes, the most flagrant is chargeable on him, who aims to establish dominion over his brethren. He wars with what is more precious than life. He

would rob men of their chief prerogative and glory; we mean of self-dominion, of that empire which is given to a rational and moral being over his own soul and his own life. Such a being is framed to find honour and happiness in forming and swaying himself, in adopting as his supreme standard, his convictions of truth and duty, in unfolding his powers by free exertion, in acting from a principle within, from his growing conscience. His proper and noblest attributes are self-government, self-reverence, energy of thought, energy in choosing the right and the good, energy in casting off all other dominion. He was created for empire in his own breast, and wo, wo to them who would pluck from him this sceptre. A mind, inspired by God with reason and conscience, and capable, through these endowments, of progress in truth and duty, is a sacred thing; more sacred than temples made with hands, or even than this outward universe. It is of nobler lineage than that of which human aristocracy makes its boast. It bears the lineaments of a Divine Parent. It has not only a physical, but moral connexion with the Supreme Being. Through its self-determining power, it is accountable for its deeds, and for whatever it becomes. Responsibility, that which above all things makes existence solemn, is laid upon it. Its great end is to conform itself, by its own energy, and by spiritual succours which its own prayers and faithfulness secure, to that perfection of wisdom and goodness, of which God is the original and source, which shines upon us from the whole outward world, but of which the intelligent soul is a truer recipient and a brighter image, even than the sun with all his splendours. From these views we learn, that no outrage, no injury, can equal that, which is perpetrated by him, who would break down and subjugate the human mind; who would rob men of self-reverence; who would bring them to stand more in awe of outward authority, than of reason and conscience in their own souls; who would make himself a standard and law for his race, and shape, by force or terror, the free spirits of others after his own judgment and will.

All excellence, whether intellectual or moral, involves, as its essential elements, freedom, energy, and moral independence, so that the invader of these, whether from the throne or the pulpit, invades the most sacred interest of the human race. Intellectual excellence implies and requires these. This does not consist in passive assent even to the highest truths; or in the most extensive stores of knowledge acquired by an implicit faith, and lodged in the inert memory. It lies in force, freshness, and independence of thought; and is most conspicuously manifested by him, who, loving truth supremely, seeks it resolutely, follows the light without fear, and modifies the views of others by the patient, strenuous, exercise of his own faculties. To a man thus intellectually free, truth is not, what it is to passive multitudes, a foreign substance, dormant, lifeless, fruitless, bnt penetrating, prolific, full of vitality, and ministering to the health and expansion of the soul. And what we have said of intellectual excellence is still more true of moral. This has its foundation and root in freedom, and cannot exist a moment without it. The very idea of virtue is, that

it is a free act, the product or result of the mind's self-determining power. It is not good feeling, infused by nature or caught by sympathy; nor is it good conduct into which we have slidden through imitation, or which has been forced upon us by another's will. We ourselves are its authors in a high and peculiar sense. We indeed depend on God for virtue. Our capacity for it is wholly his gift and inspiration, and without his perpetual aid, this capacity would avail nothing. But his aid is not compulsion. He respects—he cannot violate that moral freedom which is his richest gift. To the individual, the decision of his own character is left. He has more than kingly power in his own soul. Let him never resign it. Let none dare to interfere with it. Virtue is self-dominion, or what is the same thing, it is self-subjection to the principle of duty, that highest law in the soul. If these views of intellectual and moral excellence be just, then to invade men's freedom is to aim the deadliest blow at their honour and happiness; and their worst foe is he who fetters their reason, who makes his will their law, who makes them tools, echoes, copies of himself.

Perhaps it may be objected to the representation of virtue as consisting of self-dominion, that the Scriptures speak of it as consisting in obedience to God. But these are perfectly compatible and harmonious views; for genuine obedience to God is the free choice and adoption of a law, the great principles of which our own minds approve, and our own consciences bind on us; which is not an arbitrary injunction, but an emanation and expression of the Divine mind; and which is intended throughout to give energy, dignity, and enlargement, to our best powers. He, and he only, obeys God virtuously and acceptably, who reverences right, not power; who has chosen rectitude as his supreme rule; who sees and reveres in God the fulness and brightness of moral excellence, and who sees in obedience the progress and perfection of his own nature. That subjection to the Deity, which, we fear, is too common, in which the mind surrenders itself to mere power and will, is any thing but virtue. We fear that it is disloyalty to that moral principle, which is ever to be reverenced as God's vicegerent in the rational soul.

Perhaps some may fear, that in our zeal for the freedom and independence of the individual mind, we unsettle government, and almost imply that it is a wrong. Far from it. We hold government to be an essential means of our intellectual and moral education, and would strengthen it by pointing out its legitimate functions. Government, as far as it is rightful, is the guardian and friend of freedom, so that in exalting the one we enforce the other. The highest aim of all authority is to confer liberty. This is true of domestic rule. The great, we may say the single object of parental government, of a wise and virtuous education, is, to give the child the fullest use of his own powers; to give him inward force; to train him up to govern himself. The same is true of the authority of Jesus Christ. He came, indeed, to rule mankind; but to rule them, not by arbitrary statutes, not by force and menace, not by mere will, but by setting before them,

in precept and life, those everlasting rules of rectitude, which Heaven obeys, and of which every soul contains the living germs. He came to exert a moral power; to reign by the manifestation of celestial virtues; to awaken the energy of holy purpose in the free mind. He came to publish liberty to the captives; to open the prison door; to break the power of the passions; to break the yoke of a ceremonial religion which had been imposed in the childhood of the race; to exalt us to a manly homage and obedience of our Creator. Of civil government, too, the great end is to secure freedom. Its proper, and highest function is, to watch over the liberties of each and all, and to open to a community the widest field for all its powers. Its very chains and prisons have the general freedom for their aim. They are just, only when used to curb oppression and wrong; to disarm him who has a tyrant's heart, if not a tyrant's power, who wars against others' rights, who, by invading property or life, would substitute force for the reign of equal laws. Freedom, we repeat it, is the end of government. To exalt men to self-rule, is the end of all other rule, and he who would fasten on them his arbitrary will, is their worst foe.

We have aimed to show the guilt of the love of power and dominion, by showing the ruin which it brings on the mind, by enlarging on the preciousness of that inward freedom which it invades and destroys. To us, this view is the most impressive; but the guilt of this passion may also be discerned, and by some more clearly, in its outward influences; in the desolation, bloodshed, and woe, of which it is the perpetual cause. We owe to it almost all the miseries of war. To spread the sway of one or a few, thousands and millions have been turned into machines, under the name of soldiers, armed with instruments of destruction, and then sent to reduce others to their own lot, by fear and pain, by fire and sword, by butchery and pillage. And is it light guilt, to array man against his brother; to make murder the trade of thousands; to drench the earth with human blood; to turn it into a desert; to scatter families like chaff; to make mothers widows, and children orphans; and to do all this for the purpose of spreading a still gloomier desolation, for the purpose of subjugating men's souls, turning them into base parasites, extorting from them a degrading homage, humbling them in their own eyes, and breaking them to servility as the chief duty of life? When the passion for power succeeds, as it generally has done, in establishing despotism, it seems to make even civilization a doubtful good. Whilst the monarch and his court are abandoned to a wasteful luxury, the peasantry, rooted to the soil, and doomed to a perpetual round of labours, are raised but little above the brute. There are parts of Europe, Christian Europe, in which the peasant, through whose sweat kings and nobles riot in plenty, seems to enjoy less, on the whole, than the untamed Indian of our forests. Chained to one spot, living on the cheapest vegetables, sometimes unable to buy salt to season his coarse fare, seldom or never tasting animal food, having for his shelter a mud-walled hut, floored with earth or stone, and subjected equally with the brute to the

rule of a superior, he seems to us to partake less of animal, intellectual, and moral pleasures, than the free wanderer of the woods, whose steps no man fetters; whose wigwam no tyrant violates; whose chief toil is hunting, that noblest of sports; who feasts on the deer, that most luxurious of viands; to whom streams as well as woods, pay tribute; whose adventurous life gives sagacity; and and in whom peril nourishes courage and self-command. We are no advocates for savage life. We know that its boasted freedom is a delusion. The single fact that human nature in this wild state makes no progress, is proof enough that it wants true liberty. We mean only to say, that man, in the hands of despotism, is sometimes degraded below the savage; that it were better for him to be lawless, than to live under lawless sway.

It is the part of Christians to look on the passion for power and dominion with strong abhorrence; for it is singularly hostile to the genius of their religion. Jesus Christ always condemned it. One of the striking marks of his moral greatness, and of the originality of his character, was, that he held no fellowship and made no compromise with this universal spirit of his age, but withstood it in every form. He found the Jews intoxicating themselves with dreams of empire. Of the prophecies relating to the Messiah, the most familiar and dear to them, were those which announced him as a conqueror, and which were construed by their worldliness into a promise of triumphs to the people, from whom he was to spring. Even the chosen disciples of Jesus looked to him for this good. "To sit on his right hand and on his left," or, in other words, to hold the most commanding stations in his kingdom, was not only their lurking wish, but their open and importunate request. But there was no passion on which Jesus frowned more severely than on this. He taught, that to be great in his kingdom, men must serve, instead of ruling their brethren. He placed among them a child as an emblem of the humility of his religion. His most terrible rebukes fell on the lordly, aspiring, Pharisee. In his own person, he was mild and condescending, exacting no personal service, living with his disciples as a friend, sharing their wants, sleeping in their fishing-boat, and even washing their feet; and in all this, he expressly proposed himself to them as a pattern, knowing well, that the last triumph of disinterestedness is to forget our own superiority, in our sympathy, solicitude, tenderness, respect, and self-denying zeal, for those who are below us. We cannot, indeed, wonder that the lust of power should be encountered by the sternest rebukes and menace of Christianity, because it wages open war with the great end of this religion, which is the elevation of the human mind. No corruption of this religion is more palpable and more enormous, than that which turns it into an instrument of dominion, and which makes it teach, that man's primary duty is to give himself a passive material into the hands of his minister, priest, or king.

The subject which we now discuss, is one in which all nations have an interest, and especially our own; and we should fail of our main purpose, were we not to lead our readers to apply it to ourselves. The passion for ruling, though most completely

developed in despotisms, is confined to no forms of government. It is the chief peril of free states, the natural enemy of free institutions. It agitates our own country, and still throws an uncertainty over the great experiment we are making here in behalf of liberty. We will try then, in a few words, to expose its influences and dangers, and to abate that zeal with which a participation in office and power is sought among ourselves.

It is the distinction of republican institutions, that whilst they compel the passion for power to moderate its pretensions, and to satisfy itself with more limited gratifications, they tend to spread it more widely through the community, and to make it a universal principle. The doors of office being opened to all, crowds burn to rush in. A thousand hands are stretched out to grasp the reins which are denied to none. Perhaps in this boasted and boasting land of liberty, not a few, if called to state the chief good of a republic, would place it in this, that every man is eligible to every office, and that the highest places of power and trust are prizes for universal competition. The superiority attributed by many to our institutions, is, not that they secure the greatest freedom, but give every man a chance of ruling; not that they reduce the power of government within the narrowest limits which the safety of the state admits, but throw it into as many hands as possible. The despot's great crime is thought to be, that he keeps the delight of dominion to himself, that he makes a monopoly of it, whilst our more generous institutions, by breaking it into parcels, and inviting the multitude to scramble for it, spread this joy more widely. The result is, that political ambition infects our country, and generates a feverish restlessness and discontent, which, to the monarchist, may seem more than a balance for our forms of liberty. The spirit of intrigue, which in absolute governments is confined to courts, walks abroad through the land; and as individuals can accomplish no political purposes single handed, they band themselves into parties, ostensibly framed for public ends, but aiming only at the acquisition of power. The nominal sovereign, that is, the people, like all other sovereigns, is courted and flattered, and told that it can do no wrong. Its pride is pampered, its passions inflamed, its prejudices made inveterate. Such are the processes by which other republics have been subverted, and he must be blind who cannot trace them among ourselves. We mean not to exaggerate our dangers. We rejoice to know, that the improvements of society oppose many checks to the love of power. But every wise man, who sees its workings, must dread it as our chief foe.

This passion derives strength and vehemence in our country, from the common idea, that political power is the highest prize which society has to offer. We know not a more general delusion, nor is it the least dangerous. Instilled, as it is, in our youth, it gives infinite excitement to political ambition. It turns the active talent of the country, to public station as the supreme good, and makes it restless, intriguing, and unprincipled. It calls out hosts of selfish competitors for comparatively few places, and encourages a bold, unblushing pursuit of personal elevation, which a just moral sense and self-respect in the community would frown upon

and cover with shame. This prejudice has come down from past ages, and is one of their worst bequests. To govern others has always been thought the highest function on earth. We have a remarkable proof of the strength and pernicious influence of this persuasion, in the manner in which history has been written. Who fill the page of history? Political and military leaders, who have lived for one end, to subdue and govern their fellow beings. These occupy the foreground; and the people, the human race, dwindle into insignificance, and are almost lost behind their masters. The proper and noblest object of history, is, to record the vicissitudes of society, its spirit in different ages, the causes which have determined its progress and decline, and especially the manifestation and growth of its highest attributes and interests, of intelligence, of the religious principle, of moral sentiment, of the elegant and useful arts, of the triumphs of man over nature and himself. Instead of this, we have records of men in power, often weak, oftener wicked, who did little or nothing for the advancement of their age, who were in no sense its representatives, whom the accident of birth perhaps raised to influence. We have the quarrels of courtiers, the intrigues of cabinets, sieges and battles, royal births and deaths, and the secrets of a palace, that sink of lewdness and corruption. These are the staples of history. The inventions of printing, of gunpowder, and the mariner's compass, were too mean affairs for history to trace. She was bowing before kings and warriors. She had volumes for the plots and quarrels of Leicester and Essex, in the reign of Elizabeth, but not a page for Shakspeare; and if Bacon had not filled an office, she would hardly have recorded his name, in her anxiety to preserve the deeds and sayings of that Solomon of his age, James the First.

(To be Continued.)

THE CHRISTIAN PIONEER.

GLASGOW, *September* 1, 1828.

THE Annual Meeting of the Presbyterian and Unitarian Ministers of Lancashire and Cheshire, was held in Liverpool, on the 19th June. About thirty Ministers were present. The sermon was preached by the Rev. J. Whitehead of Cockey Moor. Among the Resolutions passed at this meeting, the following was unanimously adopted:—

"That the Members of this Association are at the same time anxious to record their desire, to see their Roman Catholic fellow-subjects in full possession of the same civil rights which they themselves enjoy."

This being the first public meeting of the Unitarians of the two counties, subsequent to the Repeal of the Test

and Corporation Acts, it was judged proper to make it a more open assembly than usual, and the friends of religious freedom of all denominations were invited to attend. A numerous company, there being upwards of one hundred and sixty gentlemen, sat down to dinner, and the Rev. W. SHEPHERD, of Gateacre, presided. The whole proceedings were worthy of the occasion. Our readers will be gratified, we are persuaded, by the Chairman's speech:—

"The time is now come, when it is my pleasant duty to direct your attention to the joyful occasion which has swelled the ordinary Meeting of the Presbyterian Ministers of Lancashire and Cheshire, and their immediate friends, into the numerous, the respectable, and, I am happy to add, in reference to religious faith, the miscellaneous assembly which I have now the honour to address. Gentlemen, I call this a joyful occasion; for we are met to celebrate the repeal of those obnoxious statutes, which for a long series of years, fixed upon the Protestant Dissenters of England, a stigma which they were conscious that they did not deserve. Gentlemen, I call it a stigma. For, by the spirit of those statutes, it was virtually declared, that we were unworthy of the favour of our sovereign,—that our gentry were so tainted and infected with evil principles, that it was dangerous to admit them to the exercise of that civil authority, for which they were qualified by their education, their property, and their talents. By the spirit of those statutes, no exciseman was allowed to fathom the depths of a barrel of beer, unless he had previously fathomed the depths of the thirty-nine articles! By the spirit of those acts, it was proclaimed, that we were all of us unfitted for a participation in the management of the affairs of the most petty corporation in the kingdom! Thus, while we were called upon to take our full share in bearing the burdens of the state, we were prohibited from seeking after its emoluments, and, what galled our feelings still more, we were forbidden to aspire to its distinctions and its honours. Gentlemen, if I may judge of the feelings of others from my own, I cannot say, in truth and honesty, that by the operation of these statutes the Protestant Dissenters of England were humiliated; for, in point of fact, no one is humiliated except by his own wrong doing, and his own misconduct. In the eye of reason, disgrace attaches itself, not to the persecuted, but to the persecutor—not to the man who is proscribed, but to the man who proscribes whole classes of his fellow-citizens without a just and adequate cause. When a man is followed by reproach and obloquy, which he is conscious that he does not merit, he redresses himself by entertaining sentiments of honest pride, in the internal persuasion that he deserves better treatment than he receives. I repeat, then, the sentiment. I cannot say that by these acts we were humiliated. But this I will say, that by their operation we were rendered uneasy and uncomfortable—that we were aggrieved and injured. But this state of things is happily past. The obnox-

ious statutes are repealed—the stigma is removed, and the Protestant Dissenter can now mingle in the affairs of the world, and take his natural station in the ranks of society, in the satisfactory assurance, that, in the eye of the law, he stands on a level with his fellow-subjects of the established faith. At the same time, gentlemen, I must remark, that the circumstances in which we stand, though they justify the heartiness, by no means call for the insolence of triumph. That extravagant exultation, on the gaining of a political point, which is calculated to give offence, arises from a pertinaciousness of opposition which we have not met with on the late occasion, from the influential statesmen of the present day, or from the great body of the members of the Church of England. The main subject of our rejoicing, is this, that the general diffusion of solid and useful knowledge, and the advantage of experience, have so beaten down and subdued inveterate prejudices, that when our case came to be debated in Parliament, it was there discussed with temperance, coolness, and moderation. Hence, it happened, that on the first division on our question in the House of Commons, we were favoured with so great a majority, that the most sceptical of our opponents were convinced that the time for concession was now come, and the repeal was carried with an ease and an approach to unanimity, by no means to have been antecedently expected on so momentous a question. Thus, gentlemen, the Corporation and Test Acts are dead and buried; and on the last melancholy occasion, John Lord Eldon acted as chief mourner. Gentlemen, I promise you, that I will not slide into the habits of my profession, and proceed to preach their funeral sermon. Discourses of this kind are very tickle and delicate matters, when we have nothing good to say of the defunct. I once, indeed, posseessed a volume of sermons preached by an ancient divine, on the occasions of the death of the wicked people of his congregation, and I am sorry to observe, gentlemen, that this volume was rather a bulky one. On its perusal, however, I did not find any thing which would induce me to imitate the example of this venerable pastor on the present occasion. Recurring, however, to the birth of these acts, I must remind you, that they were passed in critical and turbulent times, and that the Test Act in particular, was supported by many Dissenters, who, at the time of its enactment, were members of the House of Commons. Gentlemen, in my humble opinion, so far as these individuals were influenced by a dread of arbitrary power, in the prospect of a tyrannical successor to the throne, they acted well. But human action is prompted by mixed motives, and in so far as these individuals were prompted by a bigotted prejudice against the Roman Catholic religion, as a system of faith, I think they acted extremely wrong. And if wrong they did, the punishment followed hard upon the offence, and continued for a long time. In this instance, the sins of the fathers were visited upon the children, in the shape of civil disqualifications, to the third and fourth generation. It is an easy matter, gentlemen, to get into a net, but it is difficult to get out of it. Permit me to remind you, that the great and enlightened advocate of religious freedom, William the Third, though he ear-

nestly wished it, was unable to extend relief to our ancestors, even in the plenitude of his power; and many of you remember, how often, during the last reign, our question was agitated in the House of Commons, but agitated without success. Gentlemen, it was my fortune in the year 1789, to be present in the House of Commons, when, on the motion of Mr. Beaufoy, for the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, Mr. Fox rose to speak on our behalf. And never, gentlemen, shall I forget that honest countenance of his, on which the Almighty had imprinted, in the most legible characters, the index of that union of the brightest intellect, with the most engaging benevolence which characterised that illustrious and amiable man. At the commencement of his speech, his utterance seemed to be embarrassed by the intensity of his feelings, and the abundance of his matter. But he soon proceeded with a connected rapidity and energy of eloquence, which seemed to sweep away every objection in its impetuous course. He was answered by Mr. Pitt, in an elegant and measured flow of diction, in which every word seemed to stand in its proper place. On that occasion, the sophistry of the minister was victorious, and we lost the question by a majority of 20. In the ensuing year, 1790, the Dissenters renewed their application to Parliament, under the auspices of Mr. Fox. But the event proved, that, in this renewal, they had not acted wisely—that they had not observed, with due sagacity, the signs of the times. The progress of the French revolution had then alarmed the aristocracy of this country with the dread of innovation. Mr. Burke rushed into the conflict, and summoned from the lowest deep the demons of bigotry and religious discord, and his infuriated eloquence falling in with the spirit of the day, he wrought such an effect upon his audience, that the majority against us was swelled from 20 to 180.

"By this signal defeat the Dissenters were astounded, and remained in a state of quietude for 37 years; and lo and behold, when at length we began to stir, this quietude was brought as an argument against us! For when, in my capacity of chairman of a meeting of the Unitarian Dissenters of this town and neighbourhood, last spring but one, I addressed, through the medium of our secretary, a letter to the unfortunate Mr. Huskisson, requesting him to support the petition which we were sending to Parliament, praying for the repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts, our representative was pleased to reply, that, as we had been tranquil so long, he conceived that our grievances were rather imaginary than real. Gentlemen, I lost no time in replying to Mr. Huskisson, that, if Providence spared my life and health, I would take care that the Dissenters of Lancashire should never again be reproached with the crime of peace and quietness. For our excitation from this state of apparent apathy, we are mainly indebted to a gentleman whose solid abilities and transcendant personal worth, are united with a suavity of manners, and a retiring modesty of demeanour, which prevent his merits from being displayed in their full light. I allude to Mr. John Smith, the member for Midhurst. Being in London last Christmas but one, I was informed by a friend, that Mr. Smith felt strongly for the situation of the Pro-

testant Dissenters. This encouraged me to seek an interview with him, to which I was introduced and accompanied by Mr. Brougham. In the conversation which ensued, Mr. Smith spoke strongly of the Test and Corporation Acts, which he characterised as a disgrace to the Statute-book, at the same time expressing his astonishment, that the Dissenters were so tranquil under their operation, and stating, that he should be happy if he were called upon to move for their repeal. In consequence of this, I applied to an influential member of our London Committee, urging him to press that body to make the requisite application to Parliament. But this gentleman was dubious and hesitating. He thought that the time was not yet come, and that we ought to wait to sail in the wake of the Catholics. I differed from him in opinion; and at the end of an amicable discussion, I told him, that whatever the Dissenters of London might do, the Lancashire Dissenters would stir. Accordingly, soon after my return to the country, we put ourselves in motion. Happily, the London Committee soon afterwards took the field, and they managed our cause with a skill, industry, and ability, which claim from us that tribute of warm thanks, which we shall, by and by, give them in due form.

"As to the proceedings which have lately taken place in Parliament, on the motion for the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, I must remind you, that, at the commencement of those proceedings, the Duke of Wellington and Mr. Peel brought down the whole force of government in opposition to us. So far we owe them not the slightest obligation. But in justice to them, it must not be forgotten, that when they deemed it expedient to concede, they did so frankly and handsomely. They played no tricks, but took their ground firmly, and adhered to it; and gave us a cordial and effectual support. Indeed, the only opposition of a formidable nature which we encountered, arose from the wicked ingenuity of John Lord Eldon. But for this venerable statesman, great allowances ought to be made. He had not then recovered, nor, am I aware, that he has yet recovered, from the shock which he felt on his sudden and unexpected fall from the height and eminence of political power. To add to his distress, his lordship saw in his successor, a man in the prime of life, and of superior talents. Indeed, so quick is the intellect of Lord Lyndhurst, that I am credibly informed, that since his promotion, he has gone creditably through the grammar of equity law, and that he has advanced into 'easy sentences!' His Lordship is also blessed with a good constitution, and with such a happy pliability of political principle, that, like a glove that will fit any hand, he will fit any ministry that can possibly be conceived in the imagination of man! Gentlemen, in the books of our Town Council, there is an entry made, I believe in the reign of Charles II. which sets forth, that 'John Gibson was fined five shillings for profanely swearing, that, let who the devil will be Mayor, he would be Town Clerk!' In like manner, Lord Lyndhurst seems to be determined, that let who will be the Minister, he will be Lord Chancellor! Thus seeing the prospect of a resumption of the seals to be hopeless, no wonder that Lord Eldon is peevish and morose. But he was so

well disciplined for his opposition against us, by the Bishop of Chester, that I will say nothing more of him but this,—that in reference to his prognostications of woe and destruction as awaiting the Established Church, in consequence of concession to the Dissenters, I wish his lordship may live a thousand years to witness the falsification of his prophecy—always provided, that he never again insinuates himself upon the woolsack. As to the tacking of the declaration to the Bill of Repeal, I may be permitted to observe, that, if this was the work of the ministers, it reminds me of an avaricious old gentleman, who, being melted by a tale of woe, gave the applicant sixpence, but instantly thinking that he had carried his liberality too far, called the petitioner back, and said, 'Here you, Sir, give me back a penny in change!' I cannot, indeed, but wonder at the sensitiveness of the Church of England. For, speaking of that Church as a religious and political corporation, united with the State, I hold it to be impossible that the Protestant Dissenters should do her any injury. In the first place, the great body of Dissenters would never permit us, their ministers, to seize its emoluments, or to invest ourselves with its dignities. But, suppose for a moment, that the whole body of Dissenters was infected with the folly of this evil concupiscence, what would be the consequence? If the Unitarians were to grasp at the glittering prize, they would be instantly repulsed by the Calvinists; and if the Baptists were to move towards it, they would be immediately checkmated by the Independents. And if the Roman Catholics were to aim at it, the whole body of the Dissenters would be arrayed against them, and would form the rear-guard of the Established Church. That Church, then, is strong by our disunion. But we are reminded, as usual, of the times of old. We are told, that in the reign of Charles I. the Dissenters united and overthrew the Establishment. To this I answer, that if the Church of England had now a Laud for an Archbishop of Canterbury—if she were now armed with a High Commission Court—if she were now to consign to indefinite imprisonments, those who disputed her doctrines—if she were now to cut off the ear, and to slit the noses of those who found fault with her discipline, the Dissenters would again muster, and avail themselves of the first opportunity again to put her down. But the Church of England is strengthened by the abridgment of her power. Happily for her, her *dentes canini* have been drawn. She hardly possesses sufficient power to maintain discipline among her own communicants—she has no power to persecute. We have, then, no quarrel with the Church of England, as a Church, except in so far as she may place herself as an obstruction to us in the acquisition of our civil rights. But we have experienced no obstruction from her on the late occasion. On the contrary, we found some of our most enlightened and firm supporters on the episcopal bench. And, gentlemen, we ought not to shut our eyes to this fact, that the prelates who espoused our cause, and the ministers of the day, ran a risk in supporting our question. They are watched with a jealous eye by the ignorant and the bigotted of their own persuasion; and during the progress of our Bill, Lord

Eldon was vigilantly watching for an occasion to raise against them the cry of 'the danger of the Church.' We need not wonder, then, that they thought it incumbent upon them to do something as a salvo for the honour of the Church. Hence the origin of the Declaration, which formula was devised in a spirit of accommodation, and is, in my opinion, perfectly innocent. It precludes no one from resisting an illegal demand of tithes. It precludes no one from opposing the encroachments of an oppressive clerical magistrate, if such a being is to be found. In short, while the Bill of Repeal confers a valuable boon, it takes away no right which we antecedently enjoyed. Speaking individually, therefore, I shall say, in the words which my late friend, John Horne Tooke, caused to be engraved on his tomb, that I am 'content and grateful' in accepting of the Bill as it received the assent of his Majesty.

"Gentlemen, I thank you for the patience with which you have hitherto heard me, and though I am sensible that I have trespassed too much upon your time, there is one more topic to which you will permit me to advert, before I conclude. And I approach this topic with an anxiety which arises from my sense of its importance, rather than from any doubt as to the spirit with which you will receive the sentiments which I am going to utter. Gentlemen, Lucretius, at the commencement of the second book of his poem 'on the nature of things,' makes the following selfish remark:—

> 'Suave mari magno, turbantibus equora ventis,
> E terra magnum alterius spectare laborem.'
>
> 'Tis sweet to see, while standing safe on shore,
> Another struggling 'midst the billow's roar.

Shall we, gentlemen, adopt this scandalous sentiment, as our principle of action? I trust not. With regard to ourselves, the fury of the storm is past, and our vessel rides safely in the harbour. But there are others that are still struggling with the violence of the political tempest. We have lived to see the repeal of those statutes by which we were aggrieved, but our Roman Catholic fellow-subjects are still labouring under disabilities far more vexatious than any which we have ever experienced. And shall not we make use of our vantage ground to lend them a helping hand? I rejoice to observe, that by these plaudits you answer in the affirmative. Yes, it is our duty to aid the Catholics in the furtherance of their cause, as a matter of principle. It is also our duty so to do, as the payment of a debt of gratitude. For in the day of our triumph, we ought not to forget, that the Catholic Association recommended our cause to the patronage of the Irish members, in an address drawn up by Mr. O'Connel, with the utmost perspicuity, and the most forcible energy of language; and whenever Daniel O'Connel issues his recommendation to the Irish members, they do not treat that recommendation lightly. To the Catholics, then, we are under great obligations. Let us testify our sense of those obligations, by supporting their cause in private conversation, and in public discussion; and when the proper occasion

occurs, let us besiege the House of Commons with petitions on their behalf, and let us never remit our endeavours, till the advent of the happy time, when all classes of his Majesty's subjects shall recline at their ease under the broad shade of the constitution—under the shade of that venerable tree, with respect to which, it is our fervent wish, that being disencumbered of the decayed branches which deformed it, and of the parasitic plants whose mischievous adhesion robs it of its nourishment, it may stand green and flourishing, till time shall be no more."

A MAGNIFICENT service of Plate, the splendid gift of persons of various religious denominations in Belfast and the adjoining Counties, was presented on the 17th June last, to the Rev. Henry Montgomery. Upwards of five hundred persons met together in the Assembly Rooms, on its presentation. It was given, the inscription states, "in testimony of their high respect for him as a Christian minister, a friend of freedom of inquiry and universal toleration, and as an eloquent and fearless advocate of the right of private judgment." Mr. Montgomery made the following reply:

"ESTEEMED FRIENDS AND CHRISTIAN BRETHREN,

"WITH profound gratitude and honest pride, I receive the truly valuable and splendid testimonial of your regard, which has just been presented for my acceptance, accompanied by an address equally remarkable for its cordiality, its talent, its eloquence, and its moderation. Next to the approbation of God and my own conscience, I have always valued the esteem of the wise and good amongst my fellow-men; and when I consider the number, the station, and, above all, the moral respectability, of the persons by whose liberality I have been presented with a gift more magnificent than was ever bestowed upon any private individual in this part of Ireland, I feel that I am placed in a situation sufficient to gratify the highest earthly ambition. Had this affair been commenced and prosecuted with a view to support sectarian theology or party politics, I might have been grateful for the zeal of my friends, whilst I regretted the contracted feelings in which it originated; but when I perceive amongst the subscribers, men of distinguished rank and character, widely differing both in their religious and political sentiments, I exult in the important fact, that the honour conferred upon a humble individual, is connected with a glorious and immutable principle, infinitely raised above the tainted atmosphere of sect and party. The very names of your Committee, that so fairly represent the great body of the contributors, stamp upon the whole proceeding, a character equally unassailable and influential.

"It would be unjust towards you, presumptuous in myself, and derogatory to your objects, to imagine for a moment, that any trifling service, which, in the conscientious discharge of duty, I

may have been able to render to the holy cause of Christian toleration, has been the only, or even the principal reason of the distinguished reward bestowed upon my feeble exertions, by so large a body of the Laity of different Churches. Your own hearts being attuned to generous and liberal sentiments, it is evident, from the general tenor of your address, that you greatly overvalued the power of the feeble hand which touched the living instrument; but, at the same time, it is my highest gratification to perceive, that you have honoured me with your approbation, not so much as a private individual, as the humble advocate of the sacred cause of Christian liberty. Such a testimonial, from such characters, in support of an indefeasible, public principle, must, in these irritated and unsettled times, produce a salutary effect. It proves, beyond question, that although individuals may err, and public bodies lose sight of their principles, there is still a noble spirit of religious liberty alive and active in the great mass of the community. Nay more; it demonstrates, that this hallowed spirit is not confined to sect or party, but that it is the denizen of every generous breast, without distinction of creed or denomination. It is a triumphant consideration, that whilst in all ages some have endeavoured to circumscribe the charities of nature, others have still been found whose ample hearts swelled beyond the measure of all human restraints, and whose benevolent sympathies were bounded only by the rational creation of God. If such men always existed, if the darkest ages and the direst tyranny could not blot them from the earth, it is not wonderful that they should abound in the nineteenth century, and under the protection of the British constitution. Erring men may vainly imagine that they can stem the current of Christian liberty, and they may invoke the passions and prejudices of the multitude, to aid them in opposing barriers to its course; but although their puny efforts may create a momentary ripple upon its surface, it will continue to roll forward with irresistible majesty, adorning and fructifying the world. It has been well observed, that 'the school-master is abroad'—the spirit of fearless inquiry is abroad—yes, and what is more important still, the Bible is abroad; and he who shall attempt to convince mankind that strife and vain-glory may be co-existent with Christianity, will soon discover the error of his calculations.

"The proceedings of the late Synod of Ulster, may cast a momentary cloud over this cheering prospect; but I am convinced, that, in the end, they will be the means of diffusing religious light and moral beauty. Under the influence of a sudden and unexpected impulse, many estimable men forgot, for a season, the principles of their Church, and acceded to measures which they now deplore. I am perfectly satisfied, that amongst the most enlightened, experienced, and upright, of my Calvinistic brethren, there exists as little desire 'to place the yoke of bondage' on my neck, as I entertain to place it upon theirs; and I am willing to hope, that amongst the less experienced members, dogmatic theology will not be able to turn back the genial current of nature, and to implant ungenerous sentiments in the youthful breast. I

do believe there is yet a redeeming spirit in the Synod of Ulster, and that if any calculate upon disunion and strife, they will be signally disappointed.

"But it may be otherwise. The page of history and our own experience amply testify, that there is no assumption too arrogant for fallible and sinful man—no act of tyranny too gross to be perpetrated under the hallowed guise of religion. The Synod may, therefore, 'forsake its first love'—it may forget the very rudiments of those great principles upon which it stands as a Protestant and independent Church—it may expose conscientious men to inconvenience, whilst it retains hypocrites in its bosom—it may disseminate hatred and division, in the blessed name of Him who hath so frequently commanded us 'to love one another;' but it cannot arrest the progress of Christian toleration. Its late efforts have given much pain to the sincerest friends of the principles which it endeavoured to advance; and should further aggressions be attempted, I am persuaded that many distinguished men will say to those engaged in pressing them forward: 'We have preserved inviolate, the faith which we pledged on entering the Church; we have given you all that we dare to give—our Christian love, our civil courtesy, our most cordial co-operation in all plans of general usefulness; but we will not give up, what you have as little right to demand, as we have to surrender—the free exercise of our immortal minds, the inestimable privilege of diligent inquiry, and unrestricted judgment, and the unalterable allegiance which we owe to the great King and Head of the Church; we will adhere to our Bibles, and let you hold by your creeds; we will endeavour to stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free; we will place no human authority in his room, neither will we become accessaries in setting a snare for the feet of our brethren, by demanding a uniformity of opinions which we know to be unattainable, under the impious assumption of an infallibility, which we know to be absurd.' And should they, in the maintenance of such sentiments, be shunned by the intolerant, or misrepresented by the designing, the present scene affords ample proof, that they will be cheered in their onward course, by the cordial esteem of the liberal and generous of all denominations. Many of them, I am aware, may be placed in perilous situations, where they will really require the constant exercise of that moral fortitude and intrepidity, for which you have given me a degree of credit that I by no means deserve. In taking the course which I pursued at the last Synod, my duty and interest were perfectly coincident. It is my pride and happiness to be the Pastor of a truly Christian people, who have uniformly cherished in my breast those kind sentiments which animate their own. Had I been dastardly enough to conceal any opinion which I entertained, or base enough, in opposition to my conscience, to join in any act for the curtailment of Christian liberty, I might then have incurred a risk; for, I firmly believe, that, in such circumstances, there is not a member of my congregation, from the humblest to the most exalted, that would not have looked upon me with coldness and disapprobation.

"I entirely concur in your desire, not to impugn the motives of those who dissent from our views of Christian liberty and universal toleration. We think them wrong—we consider their principles and conduct as detrimental to the cause of truth, by checking free inquiry, as calculated to ensnare the consciences of men, by holding out temptations to dissimulation, and as injurious to the well-being of society, by sowing the baneful seeds of contention and disunion; but the charity of the Gospel, which 'thinketh no evil,' teaches us to hope that they are perfectly sincere. Of this, however, I am convinced, that if they be sincere (and I firmly believe that many of them at least are so) they will gradually become more humble-minded, and more charitable to their brethren; so that in the end, we may be all brought as children of one gracious Parent, and expectants of salvation, through one common Lord, 'to forbear one another, and to forgive one another, as God, for Christ's sake, hath forgiven us.'

"I feel the total inadequacy of language, to convey a just conception of the deep sense of gratitude which I entertain for your kind expressions of approbation respecting the manner in which I have discharged my humble, but arduous duties as a public teacher, and the delicate terms in which you so flatteringly advert to my private walk and conversation. Such expressions of regard from those who have seen 'my goings out and comings in,' during the principal part of my public life, and especially from those who are themselves so much distinguished for all the virtues that can grace individuals or benefit society, are not only truly gratifying, but most deeply affecting. I trust for pardon to the honest sympathies of your own bosoms, when I say—that, much as I prize your splendid gift, and highly as I value the other portions of your eloquent and Christian address, I do, as a husband and a father, thank you for the cordiality and kindness of that short paragraph, more than for them all. 'So long as memory holds her seat,' I shall treasure up the most grateful recollection of your kindness; and when the heart, which now swells with emotions which the tongue cannot express, shall have ceased to beat, I trust that I shall leave those behind me, who, 'from generation to generation,' will cherish the lasting remembrance of this day. Your Address, with the honourable names affixed to it, I shall transmit to my children, with more honest satisfaction than I would hand down the title-deeds of an estate: and to the names of all the contributors, which are engraved upon your bequest, I shall often turn their attention, that they may learn to respect the benefactors of their father, to cherish sentiments of Christian liberality, and to maintain the path of integrity, as that of safety and honour, amidst all the seductions of the world.

"To every contributor, I return my heartfelt thanks, for the individual compliment bestowed upon myself; but, more especially, for his setting his seal to the great cause of the rights of conscience. To the members of your Committee, I owe a debt of gratitude, which I am as unable to express as to repay; and were it not invidious to particularise individuals, where all have been so courteous and so kind, there are some to whom I would personally,

and by name, pay the public tribute of my unfeigned gratitude and esteem. I am well aware, however, that none of you have descended from your elevated rank, or neglected your important avocations, to mingle in this affair, with any other view than to give the weight of your character and names to the support of 'Christian toleration; and the general and cordial approbation by which your views have been seconded, must be as satisfactory to you as it is truly gratifying to me.

"Whilst I have endeavoured to avoid a brevity of reply, which might have been construed into disrespect or insensibility, I fear that I have run into the opposite extreme. But if a good motive be any apology for an erroneous act, I am not without excuse; for, in trespassing so long upon your patience, my sole aim has been to give, as far as words can give it, adequate expression to the feelings of my heart. That I have not succeeded better in my object, is chiefly owing to the situation in which your unequalled kindness and generosity have placed me, by conferring upon me a gift, which, I joyfully admit, is well suited to the respectability of the donors, but altogether disproportioned to the very humble merits of the receiver.

"That the genuine spirit of the Gospel of peace, which breathes nothing but charity and forbearance, may speedily acquire more influence in our native land—that 'the strife of words' may soon be changed for the hallowed accents of brotherly love—and that the ample blessing of a benignant Providence may rest upon you and yours—is, my much esteemed friends and benefactors, the fervent prayer of,

"Your truly obliged, and sincerely grateful,

"H. MONTGOMERY."

THE following Resolutions were unanimously approved at the Annual Meeting of the Kent and Sussex Unitarian Association, held at Tenterden, on the 25th June. They would have been inserted in our last Number, had there been room. We deem them too important not to be recorded. They were moved by Mr. C. Ellis of Maidstone, and seconded by Mr. Joseph Munn of Tenterden, an excellent and truly estimable young man, who, a few years since, nobly refused a lucrative office, rather than prostitute the dying memorial of his Saviour's love, by making it "the picklock to a place," and who, amidst temptations before which older persons have fallen, preserved a conscience unseared by the mammon of unrighteousness.

"That this Association most cordially congratulates the Protestant Dissenters of the United Kingdom, upon being happily rescued from the unmerited opprobrium and galling restraints imposed upon them, for a century and a half, by two Statutes commonly called the Corporation and Test Acts.

"That this Association cannot conceal its regret, that the Bill for the Repeal of the above Acts, should impose a Declaration relating to ecclesiastical matters, that may be construed into an interference with the rights of conscience, and an infringement on religious liberty.

"That this Association being of opinion, that it is the duty of every man to worship God agreeably to the dictates of his conscience, considers, that no individual ought to be debarred from the possession of civil rights on account of his religious creed; and, that to exclude, on this ground, any of his Majesty's subjects from the full enjoyment of civil advantages, is alike dangerous and injurious to the stability, power, and happiness of the British Empire.

"That this Association, feeling grateful to many individuals and collective bodies connected with the Roman Catholics of Great Britain and Ireland, for having so nobly aided and encouraged the emancipation of the Protestant Dissenters, gladly seizes upon the present opportunity, to impress upon all the Societies in connection with it, the duty of immediately petitioning the Legislature, to grant to his Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects, a full and complete participation in all the blessings and privileges of the British Constitution."

On Wednesday, 9th July, was held at Swansea, the Anniversary Meeting of the South Wales Unitarian Society. In the morning, the Rev. Dr. Rees of Stamford-Street Chapel, London, having introduced the worship by reading the Scriptures and prayer, the Rev. J. James of Gellionen, delivered an excellent discourse in the Welsh language, from Romans i. 16, on the connection between faith and salvation. He was followed by the Rev. R. Aspland of Hackney, who, in a sermon on 1 Cor. iv. 13, explained and eloquently defended the general principles of Unitarianism. When the business of the Society had been transacted, above eighty friends dined together—Mr. Aspland in the Chair. The evening service was conducted by the Rev. H. Bowen of Coventry, and the Rev. D. Davison of Jewin-Street, London, delivered an impressive discourse on Acts xx. 27, and concluded the services of the day; which, by those who were present, will long be remembered with feelings of pleasing satisfaction, and from which we anticipate no small good will accrue, in the advancement of religious truth and Christian liberality.

Unitarianism in India.—In this interesting and important portion of the world, the prospect continues to brighten for the diffusion of rational and scriptural views of religion. The labours of Rammohun Roy are producing a part of their merited effect, in

the increased attention to religious and moral reformation. The Rev. W. Adam, formerly a Calvinist Baptist Missionary, is proceeding with zeal and judgment in the prosecution of the Unitarian Mission, aided by the British & Foreign, and American Unitarian Associations. The excellent and indefatigable *native* teacher, William Roberts of Madras, assisted also by the British & Foreign Unitarian Association, is disseminating, to the utmost extent of his power, the truths of the everlasting Gospel among his countrymen. Ground has been purchased for the erection of a Unitarian Chapel at Calcutta. For some time, there has existed a Unitarian Committee in Calcutta, corresponding with Britain and America; and on the 30th December last, at a General Meeting of the friends and supporters of Unitarian Christianity in Calcutta, a Report of past proceedings was read by the Secretary, the Rev. W. Adam, which concluded by proposing the formation of a more extended Association, for the diffusion of religion and knowledge, by means of lectures to the natives, schools, tracts, &c. The resolutions were generally moved by influential *Natives*, and seconded by British residents, and the establishment unanimously resolved on, of "THE BRITISH INDIAN UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION." Its members have our best wishes and prayers for their happiness and success. We are persuaded, that it is alone those views of the Gospel, which are inculcated by Christian Unitarians, that can bring the inhabitants of Hindostan into the fold of Christ; and we do sincerely rejoice, that God has opened a pathway into this wilderness of error, to those who will publish liberty to the captives of superstition, and who will stay the wheels of the idol's chariot, not by prostrating the understandings of their fellow-creatures before similar abominations, but by elevating the human mind, and opening the human heart, and teaching both to aspire to a nearer and nearer resemblance to the all-merciful Father of Creation's habitants. May their plans be founded in wisdom, and prosecuted with benevolence; and may Heaven, in mercy to a benighted land, smile on and bless their holy and righteous efforts for the good of man.

Unitarianism in America.—It is with pleasure we give the following extract from a letter of one of our respected American friends and correspondents. "As to the progress of the good cause in our own country, it is great and rapid. Unitarians are now to be found every where—in every village, and in every orthodox church. Churches are building up in the remoter parts of the country, and the difficulty is, not to procure congregations, but to educate preachers as fast as they are wanted. In ten years, there have been settled from the school in Cambridge, forty-seven Unitarian ministers. It is now supplying twenty parishes with candidates for settlement. The "*Christians*," who are Unitarians, are increasing with an astonishing rapidity. In Boston, a violent and united effort has been made by the Orthodox, to put down or depress and discourage Unitarianism; but they have been foiled at every attempt, and our cause never boasted before in that place,

so many, and so many bold and intelligent advocates as at this moment. It never stood on so solid and immoveable a foundation. The party has been winnowed, thoroughly winnowed, and a little chaff has blown over to the other side. The ignorant, half-informed, and disaffected, have been separated; but these proved to be but two or three: the rest stand firm to the truth. There are now in that city alone, twelve Unitarian societies, having from one hundred and fifty families to four hundred families in each. Population, sixty thousand. New England will, in no long time, become wholly convert to the truth as it is in Jesus."

Mr. Harris cannot allow this Number of the Christian Pioneer to go forth to the world, without expressing his sincere and grateful acknowledgments for the pleasure he experienced, and the kindness and attention he received, from his numerous and highly valued friends, on his late journey. Its remembrance will cheer and animate his efforts, and impel to perseverance and earnestness in the work of Christian Reformation. It is his fervent wish, that peace may be in their families, and prosperity in their habitations.

Mr. Harris also only utters the united voice of the Unitarian Congregation of Glasgow, in recording their feelings of gratitude and thankfulness, for the important aid they have received from their English brethren. The Subscription List will be kept open till the close of the present year, as they still hope to receive contributions, however small, from those Congregations and individuals who have not yet united in this benevolent work. A statement of the names and donations will be given either in the January or February Number of the Christian Pioneer for 1829.

Ireland.

The Unitarian Congregation of Glasgow acknowledge with sincere thankfulness, the receipt of Seven Pounds Fifteen Shillings, forwarded to them towards the liquidation of the Chapel debt, from their friends at Cork, contributed, as it is expressed, "as a testimony of their approbation of the exertions of the Unitarians of Glasgow, in the cause of religious liberty and scriptural truth." They venture to express the hope, that the example of Cork will be followed by others of their brethren in Ireland.

THE

CHRISTIAN PIONEER.

No. 26. October, 1828. Vol. III.

To the Editor of the Christian Pioneer.

Sir,

Nearly six years have elapsed, since, in the preface to the 2d edition of my "Sequel," I expressed my feelings and opinion respecting Dr. Wardlaw's charge, that, in the controversy between us, I had been guilty of "*wilful and deliberate misrepresentation.*" He has at length noticed my remarks, in the preface to the 4th and much enlarged edition of his "Discourses," published this summer. As he there continues and renews his former accusation, though not with the same asperity of language, I am induced, in justice to myself, and as a further contribution of my humble, but earnest and solemn testimony to the cause of most important scripture truth, to request your insertion of a few remarks in reply.

As my opponent has commenced his recent observations with an account of the "facts," and as such an account is now evidently rendered necessary by the complicated nature of the dispute, as well as by the length of time which has intervened since it occurred, I also shall, in the first place, recall to your readers the circumstances which led to Dr. Wardlaw's accusation, and the tenor of my answer to it. But my account of "the simple facts" will be essentially different from Dr. Wardlaw's; and in proof of the correctness of mine, I only request those of your readers, who still take an interest in the question, not merely to read my account with attention, but to examine the passages in our respective publications, to which I shall refer. I also beg the reader to bear in mind, that the writers in every controversy are continually obliged to make use of two distinct processes, first, the *statement*, and then the *refutation* of the opinions, which they are combating, and that it is of great importance that these two processes should not be confounded.

I think I may venture to assert, that the distinction between these two processes has seldom been more carefully observed than in the 4th Chapter of the 3d Part of

my "Vindication of Unitarianism," in which I have stated and endeavoured to refute the orthodox doctrine of the union of the Divine and human natures in the person of Jesus Christ. The *second* and *third* paragraphs of that Chapter are occupied with the *statement* of the doctrine; in the *fourth* paragraph I proceed to the *refutation* of it, clearly marking the transition from the narrative to the argumentative style, by the use of the conjunction "*therefore.*"* Before giving my statement of the doctrine, I

---

* [As there may be persons who will not take the trouble, and as there may also be many who may not have the opportunity of referring to Mr. Yates's work, we think it right to give the three paragraphs in a Note, marking them as they are noticed by Mr. Yates.—*Ed.*]

2*d Par.*] "Before we begin to examine the evidence for the orthodox opinion concerning the nature of Christ, it is necessary to know what that opinion is. Nothing could indicate greater irreverence for a question of such vast importance, than to argue and dispute without even understanding what we wish to prove. It is therefore a matter of no small satisfaction, that Mr. Wardlaw's statements are clear and intelligible. He lays down his doctrine in the following terms; (p. 33;) 'that Jesus Christ is truly God; that in his person there subsisted, when he was on earth, and still subsists a union of the Divine and Human Natures.' It appears also from the general train of language and argument, pursued through his volume, that, while he believes the *man* Christ Jesus to have been finite, created, mortal, dependent, exposed to suffering, and limited in power and knowledge, he also believes, that this same person, being *God* as well as man, was infinite, uncreated, immortal, independent, incapable of suffering, omnipotent, and omniscient.

3*d Par.*] "All Trinitarians believe, that Jesus Christ was but *one person*, although possessing *two natures*. Their doctrine is, that one of the three infinite minds in the Godhead was so united to a human soul, as to form one intelligent being, retaining the properties both of the God and of the man.

4*th Par.*] "By the *Nature* of any thing we always mean its *Qualities*. When therefore it is said, that Jesus Christ possesses both a Divine and a Human Nature, it must be meant, that he possesses both the qualities of God and the qualities of Man. But, if we consider what these qualities are, we perceive them to be totally incompatible with one another. The qualities of *God are eternity, independence, immutability, entire and perpetual exemption from pain and death, omniscience, and omnipotence.* The qualities of *Man* are, *derived existence, dependence, liability to change, to suffering, and to dissolution, comparative weakness and ignorance.* To maintain therefore, that the same mind is endued both with a Divine and a Human nature, is to maintain, that *the same mind* is both *created* and *uncreated*, both *finite* and *infinite*, both *dependent* and *independent*, both *changeable* and *unchangeable*, both *mortal* and *immortal*, both *susceptible of pain* and *incapable of it*, both *able to do all things* and *not able*, both *acquainted with all things* and *not acquainted with them*, both *ignorant* of certain subjects and *possessed of the most intimate knowledge* of them. If it be not certain, that such a doctrine as this is false, there is no certainty upon any subject. It is vain to call it a *mystery;* it is an *absurdity*, it is an *impossibility*. According to *my* ideas of propriety and duty, by assenting to it, I should culpably abuse those faculties of understanding, which have been given

have pointed out the necessity of making such a statement in clear and intelligible terms. Immediately after these preliminary observations, I have produced my statement; and, in doing so, *I have adopted the very words of my opponent*, not only because his account of the doctrine appeared "clear and intelligible," but because I thought this the best possible way of doing justice to him, and of obviating misapprehension and cavil. I have annexed three sentences designed to show, that the statement of the doctrine, which Dr. Wardlaw gave, and which I have adopted from him, is conformable to the general strain of his language and argument in other parts of his "Discourses," and also to the views of Trinitarians in general.† To this account of the tenet, Dr. Wardlaw has never offered the least objection, and I may be allowed to consider his silence upon so important a point, as an implied admission, that it is correct and true.

Having thus done what I then considered, and do still consider, as ample justice both to my subject and to my opponent and his numerous partisans, by a clear, fair, and hitherto unassailed statement of the doctrine in question, I proceeded to the refutation of it. My argument is briefly this, that the doctrine of the union of the divine and human natures in the person of Christ cannot be true, because, as the nature of a thing always means its attributes, qualities, or properties, and as many of the properties of God are directly opposed to and quite incompatible with the properties of man, the doctrine implies, that the same person possesses qualities, which are utterly inconsistent, and which cannot by any possibility meet in the same subject. To many of my readers as well as to myself, this argument has appeared perfectly unobjectionable and decisive.

My "Vindication of Unitarianism" was answered by Dr. W. in his book called "Unitarianism Incapable of

---

me to be employed in distinguishing between right and wrong, truth and error. According to the maxims, laid down as the guides of our inquiry, and acknowledged by Mr. Wardlaw as fundamental principles, (See P. I. Ch. 4,) this doctrine could not be established even by the clearest declarations of the Scriptures. For the testimony of the Scriptures would not prove it to be true; on the contrary, its occurrence in the Scriptures would prove them to be false."

† In the 4th edition (p. 65), Dr. Wardlaw has tacitly altered the statement in question, by substituting "*nature*" in the singular, instead of "*natures*" in the plural number. His language was more correct before the alteration.

Vindication." In Part II. Chap. iv. of that work, he says, "I come now to his statement of the orthodox doctrine respecting the person of Christ." But the whole of that statement Dr. W. has passed over without the slightest remark: any one, who read his book without consulting mine, as nine-tenths of his readers probably do, would suppose that I had never given such a statement. He quotes accurately the whole of my words both before and after it: the statement itself he has entirely omitted. Instead of it, he quotes at full length the reasoning, which I advanced as a refutation of his doctrine; and not being able, as I shall take the liberty of assuming, to overthrow that reasoning, he advances the angry charge of "wilful and deliberate misrepresentation," followed by numerous expressions, which are among the most vituperative in his volume.

Dr. Wardlaw, however, thinks it necessary to prove his charge, and for this purpose quotes a passage, in which I have mentioned the decision of the Council of Chalcedon, that notwithstanding the union of the Divine and human natures in the person of Christ, those natures continue *distinct.*

I have maintained in reply, that it is this very circumstance, which establishes the justice of my argument; that, if the two natures, instead of continuing distinct, had been represented as mixed or confounded so as to produce, in the language of Dr. Barrow, "a third nature different from both," the doctrine might not have been self-contradictory; but that this view of it is decidedly rejected by the orthodox; and that the palpable absurdity of their opinion consists in this, that they represent two opposite and incompatible natures to be united in one and the same person without any change in those natures, without any mixture or confusion of them, without producing any thing between the two, any third nature partly human and partly divine, that according to this view Jesus Christ is perfect God and perfect man, and that, consequently, one and the same mind or person possesses at the same time properties, which are self-contradictory and utterly inconsistent. Such was my argument, which I have now carefully reviewed, and which I still think decisive.

Nothing further occurred upon this subject, except that in advertisements to the Second Editions of my "Vindication" and my "Sequel," I expressed my earnest hope, that Dr. W. would think himself called upon, as a man of

honour and integrity, to correct in some degree his various mis-statements, and especially to withdraw the heavy charge, which he has preferred against me, and which I considered no less serious than an attack upon my life.

At length Dr. Wardlaw has condescended to notice my complaint, and I shall now beg the attention of your readers, to a few remarks in reply to what he has advanced. First, as I before observed, he gives what he intends to be taken as a history of the dispute. "The simple facts," says he, "are these. In professing to give a statement to his readers of the Trinitarian doctrine respecting the union of the divine and human natures in the person of Christ, my opponent had presented a hideous caricature, in which the attributes of the two natures were blended and confounded together in heterogeneous and contradictory combination,—as if in his human nature he had been divine, and in his divine nature human." Waving a reply to any other inaccuracies in this passage, I object most positively to the words, "*In professing to give a statement.*" In producing the argument, which Dr. Wardlaw here calls "a hideous caricature," I did not profess to give a statement. My statement of the disputed doctrine was given in the four preceding sentences, which Dr. Wardlaw has never yet quoted or noticed, although he has quoted the entire passages both before and after them. To have written the obnoxious passage, which he has quoted, as a statement of the doctrine, would have been improper, because, so far as I know, the doctrine has never been so stated by those who have maintained it. But, after I had stated their doctrine in their own words, I was at liberty to argue against it, and, if I could, to prove its absurdity; and this is what I have attempted to do in the offensive paragraph,—with force, I allow, but not with fraud or unfairness.

Thrice in his subsequent remarks, does Dr. Wardlaw represent my attempted refutation of the Trinitarian doctrine as a pretended "*statement*" of it, in producing which he however says, that I may have been tempted to incorporate with it the *inferences*, which I conceived to flow from the doctrine. He justly observes, that to have thus incorporated the deductions of my own mind with what I advanced as a statement of the doctrine, would have been unfair and reprehensible. I admit it; but I am not liable

to the charge. I have first given a statement of the doctrine, and followed that statement by my deductions, keeping the latter perfectly distinct from the former.

Dr. Wardlaw next proceeds to inform me what course I ought to have adopted. "His duty was to present their doctrine without addition or abatement, as actually professed by themselves: and, having done this, he was quite at liberty to demonstrate, if he could, the inconsistencies and impossibilities which he conceived it to imply." *It was my duty to present the doctrine of Trinitarians without addition or abatement, as actually professed by themselves.* That duty I fulfilled. In the sentences, which Dr. Wardlaw has omitted to notice, and which consequently his readers would imagine that I never wrote, I STATED THE DOCTRINE IN HIS OWN WORDS. *Having done this, I was quite at liberty to demonstrate, if I could, the inconsistencies and impossibilities which I conceived it to imply.* This I did also, and for doing so Dr. Wardlaw charged me and still charges me with "wilful and deliberate misrepresentation," with presenting "*a hideous* caricature," indulging "a malicious fancy," &c. Yet this is the man, who has preached and written his "Discourses" with repeated and most solemn professions of a single regard to truth and duty, who continues to give grave admonitions upon candour and upon the danger of unchristian animosity, and expresses "his desire to avoid the indulgence and manifestation of any other temper than that of the most friendly goodwill towards the *persons* of Unitarians."

I fear, Sir, that the remarks now offered, may appear minute and tedious, even to those of your readers who took the liveliest interest in the controversy between Dr. Wardlaw and myself, and who manifested towards me, during the period of my residence among them, the most kind and affectionate dispositions. But to me, a charge of so serious a nature, whether it comes from a man who deserves respect for his integrity, or from one who strives to surround a hollow character with the glare of popularity, is harassing and painful. Could I be indifferent to such an accusation, never but once in my life preferred against me, I should think myself very deficient in correct moral feeling. I should not merely esteem it base to prefer such a charge, without solemn reflection and the most imperious necessity, but also to submit to it, without careful self-examination and without seeking to prove my inno-

cence, if it could be established, or to acknowledge my guilt, if conscience whispered that I had been in fault.

But silence on such an occasion, would not be an offence solely against my own becoming and justifiable feelings, and the necessary defence of my own character. It would also be a neglect of the great cause, which in the course of Providence I have been called upon to defend, and the defence of which, in so far as it has been worthily maintained, I shall ever esteem the highest honour of my life. It is evident, that in such a contest the whole value of my testimony depends upon my reputation for strict veracity. Were I capable of "wilful and deliberate misrepresentation," my readers could not confide in any of my assertions upon numerous points, which are beyond the reach of their knowledge and judgment, such as the genuineness of texts, the correctness of translations, and the facts of ecclesiastical history. Hence, there can be no shorter, though at the same time no more disingenuous way of destroying my authority as a controversialist, than to convince the world that I am unworthy of being trusted. The ambitious Dr. Horsley in commencing his attacks upon Priestley, warily declined refuting the numerous particulars in the work of the heresiarch, and expressed his intention of doing nothing more than merely showing his utter incompetency to write at all upon the subject. Dr. Wardlaw, who as a scholar stands at a very humble distance below Horsley, does not attempt to prove the incompetency of his opponent, but, choosing another short way to the same object, brings against him the charge of "wilful and deliberate misrepresentation." But, as Dr. Priestley proved to the satisfaction of all impartial judges, that his competency for the task as a scholar and ecclesiastical historian was at least equal to that of his antagonist, so I trust I have shown, that, notwithstanding the odious attempt of my opponent, I am still free from any just suspicion of fraud, and I am conscious, that a strict regard to the preservation of correctness and truth in all my statements, has been throughout the whole course of the controversy, a deeply impressed and predominant sentiment in my mind.

I am, Sir, Yours respectfully,

Sept. 3d, 1828. James Yates.

"*A Discourse delivered at the Installation of the Rev. Mellish Irving Motte, as Pastor of the South Congregational Society in Boston, May* 21, 1828.—*By William Ellery Channing, D. D.*"

(Concluded from page 10.)

I have endeavoured to show the great purpose of the christian doctrine respecting God, or in what its importance and glory consist. Had I time, I might show, that every other doctrine of our religion has the same end. I might particularly show how wonderfully fitted are the character, example, life, death, resurrection, and all the offices of Christ, to cleanse the mind from moral evil—to quicken, soften, elevate, and transform it into the divine image; and I might show that these are the influences which true faith derives from him, and through which he works out our salvation. But I cannot enter on this fruitful subject. Let me only say, that I see every where in Christianity, this great design of liberating and raising the human mind, on which I have enlarged. I see in Christianity nothing narrowing or depressing, nothing of the littleness of the systems which human fear, and craft, and ambition, have engendered. I meet there no minute legislation, no descending to precise details, no arbitrary injunctions, no yoke of ceremonies, no outward religion. Every thing breathes freedom, liberality, enlargement. I meet there, not a formal, rigid creed, binding on the intellect, through all ages, the mechanical, passive repetition of the same words—the same ideas; but I meet a few grand, all-comprehending truths, which are given to the soul, to be developed and applied by itself; given to it, as seed to the sower, to be cherished and expanded, by its own thought, love, and obedience, into more and more glorious fruits of wisdom and virtue. I see it every where inculcating an enlarged spirit of piety and philanthropy, leaving each of us to manifest this spirit according to the monitions of his individual conscience. I hear it every where calling the soul to freedom and power, by calling it to guard against the senses, the passions, the appetites, through which it is chained, enfeebled, destroyed. I see it every where aiming to give the mind power over the outward world—to make it superior to events, to suffering, to material nature, to persecution, to death. I see it every where aiming to give the mind power over itself, to invest it with

inward sovereignty, to call forth within us a mighty energy for our own elevation. I meet in Christianity only discoveries of a vast, bold, illimitable character; fitted and designed to give energy and expansion to the soul. By its doctrine of a Universal Father, it sweeps away all the barriers of sect, party, rank, and nation, in which men have laboured to shut up their love; makes us members of an unbounded family; and establishes sympathies between man and the whole intelligent creation. In the character of Christ, it sets before us *moral perfection*, that greatest and most quickening miracle in human history, a purity, which shows no stain or touch of the earth, an excellence unborrowed, unconfined, bearing no impress of any age or any nation, the very image of the Universal Father; and it encourages us, by assurances of God's merciful aid, to propose this enlarged, unsullied virtue, as the model and happiness of our moral nature. By the cross of Christ, it sets forth the spirit of self-sacrifice with an energy never known before, and, in thus crucifying selfishness, frees the mind from its worst chain. By Christ's resurrection, it links this short life with eternity, discovers to us in the fleeting present, the germ of an endless future, reveals to us the human mind ascending to other worlds, breathing a freer air, forming higher connexions, and summons us to a force of holy purpose becoming such a destination. To conclude, Christianity every where sets before us God in the character of infinitely free, rich, boundless Grace, in a clemency which is "not overcome by evil, but overcomes evil with good;" and a more animating and ennobling truth, who of us can conceive? I have hardly glanced at what Christianity contains. But who does not see that it was sent from heaven, to call forth and exalt human nature, and that this is its great glory?

It has been my object in this discourse, to lay open a great truth—a central, all-comprehending truth of Christianity. Whoever intelligently and cordially embraces it, obtains a standard by which to try all other doctrines, and to measure the importance of all other truths. Is it so embraced? I fear not. I apprehend that it is dimly discerned by many who acknowledge it, whilst on many more it has hardly dawned. I see other views prevailing, and prevailing in a greater or less degree among all bodies of Christians, and they seem to me among the worst errors of our times. Some of these I would now briefly notice.

There are those, who, instead of placing the glory of Christianity in the pure and powerful action which it gives to the human mind, seem to think, that it is rather designed to substitute the activity of another for our own. They imagine the benefit of the religion to be, that it enlists on our side an almighty being who does every thing for us. To disparage human agency, seems to them the essence of piety. They think Christ's glory to consist, not in quickening free agents to act powerfully on themselves, but in changing them by an irresistible energy. They place a Christian's happiness, not so much in powers and affections unfolded in his own breast, as in a foreign care extended over him—in a foreign wisdom which takes the place of his own intelligence. Now the great purpose of Christianity is, not to procure or offer to the mind a friend on whom it may passively lean, but to make the mind itself wise, strong, and efficient. Its end is, not that wisdom and strength as subsisting in another, should do every thing for us, but that these attributes should grow perpetually in our own souls. According to Christianity, we are not carried forward as a weight, by a foreign agency; but, God, by means suited to our moral nature, quickens and strengthens us to walk ourselves. The great design of Christianity is, to build up in our own souls a power to withstand, to endure, to triumph. Inward vigour is its aim. That we should do most for ourselves, and most for others: this is the glory it confers, and in this its happiness is found.

2. I pass to another illustration of the insensibility of men to the great doctrine, that the happiness and glory of Christianity, consist in the healthy and lofty frame to which it raises the mind. I refer to the propensity of multitudes, to make a wide separation between religion, or christian virtue, and its rewards. That the chief reward lies in the very spirit of religion, they do not dream. They think of being Christians for the sake of something beyond the christian character, and something more precious. They think that Christ has a greater good to give, than a strong and generous love towards God and mankind; and would almost turn from him with scorn, if they thought him only a benefactor to the mind. It is this low view, which dwarfs the piety of thousands. Multitudes are serving God for wages distinct from the service, and hence superstition, slavishness, and formality, are substituted for inward energy and spiritual worship.

3. Men's ignorance of the great truth stated in this discourse, is seen in the low ideas attached by multitudes to the word *salvation*. Ask multitudes, what is the chief evil from which Christ came to save them, and they will tell you, "From hell, from penal fires, from future punishment." Accordingly, they think, that salvation is something which another may achieve for them, very much as a neighbour may quench a conflagration that menaces their dwellings and lives. That word *hell*—which is used so seldom in the sacred pages, which, as critics will tell you, does not occur once in the writings of Paul, and Peter, and John—which we meet only in four or five discourses of Jesus, and which all persons, acquainted with Jewish geography, know to be a metaphor, a figure of speech, and not a literal expression—this word, by a perverse and exaggerated use, has done unspeakable injury to Christianity. It has possessed and diseased men's imaginations with outward tortures, shrieks, and flames; given them the idea of an outward ruin, as what they have chiefly to dread; turned their thoughts to Jesus, as an outward deliverer; and thus blinded them to his true glory, which consists in his setting free and exalting the soul. Men are flying from an outward hell, when in truth they carry within them the hell which they should chiefly dread. The salvation which man chiefly needs, and that which brings with it all other deliverance, is salvation from the evil of his own mind. There is something far worse than outward punishment. It is sin; it is the state of a soul, which has revolted from God, and cast off its allegiance to conscience and the divine word; which renounces its Father, and hardens itself against Infinite Love; which, endued with divine powers, enthrals itself to animal lusts; which makes gain its god; which has capacities of boundless and ever-growing love, and shuts itself up in the dungeon of private interests; which, gifted with a self-directing power, consents to be a slave, and is passively formed by custom, opinion, and changing events; which, living under God's eye, dreads man's frown or scorn, and prefers human praise to its own calm consciousness of virtue; which tamely yields to temptation, shrinks with a coward's baseness from the perils of duty, and sacrifices its glory and peace in parting with self-control. No ruin can be compared to this. This the impenitent man carries with him beyond the grave, and there meets its natural

issue, and inevitable retribution, in remorse, self-torture, and woes unknown on earth. This we cannot too strongly fear. *To save*, in the highest sense of that word, is to lift the fallen spirit from this depth, to heal the diseased mind, to restore it to energy and freedom of thought, conscience, and love. This was chiefly the salvation for which Christ shed his blood. For this the holy spirit is given; and to this all the truths of Christianity conspire.

4. Another illustration of the error which I am labouring to expose, and which places the glory and importance of Christianity in something besides its quickening influence on the soul, is afforded in the common apprehensions formed of *heaven*, and of the methods by which it may be obtained. Not a few, I suspect, conceive of heaven as a foreign good. It is a distant country, to which we are to be conveyed by an outward agency. How slowly do men learn that heaven is the perfection of the mind, and that Christ gives it now just as far as he raises the mind to celestial truth and virtue. It is true, that this word is often used to express a future felicity; but the blessedness of the future world is only a continuance of what is begun here. There is but one true happiness, that of mind unfolding its best powers, and attaching itself to great objects; and Christ gives heaven, only in proportion as he gives this elevation of character. The disinterestedness, and moral strength, and filial piety of the Christian, are not mere means of heaven, but heaven itself, and heaven now.

The most exalted idea we can form of the future state, is, that it brings and joins us to God. But is not approach to this great Being begun on earth? Another delightful view of heaven, is, that it unites us with the good and great of our own race, and even with higher orders of beings. But this union is one of spirit, not of mere place; it is accordance of thought and feeling, not an outward relation; and does not this harmony begin even now? and is not virtuous friendship on earth essentially the pleasure which we hope hereafter? What place would be drearier than the future mansions of Christ, to one who should want sympathy with their inhabitants, who could not understand their language, who would feel himself a foreigner there, who would be taught, by the joys which he could not partake, his own loneliness and desolation? These views, I know, are often given with greater or less distinctness; but they seem to me not to have brought

home to men the truth, that the fountain of happiness must be in our own souls. Gross ideas of futurity still prevail. I should not be surprised, if, to some among us, the chief idea of heaven were that of a splendour, a radiance, like that which Christ wore on the Mount of Transfiguration. Let us all consider, and it is a great truth, that heaven has no lustre surpassing that of intellectual and moral worth; and that, were the effulgence of the sun and stars concentrated in the Christian, even this would be darkness, compared with the pure beamings of wisdom, love, and power, from his mind. Think not then, that Christ has come to give heaven as something distinct from virtue. Heaven is the freed and sanctified mind, enjoying God through accordance with his attributes, multiplying its bonds and sympathies with excellent beings, putting forth noble powers, and ministering, in union with the enlightened and holy, to the happiness and virtue of the universe.

My friends, I fear I have been guilty of repetition. But I feel the greatness of the truth which I deliver, and I am anxious to make it plain. Men need to be taught it perpetually. They have always been inclined to look to Christ for something better, as they have dreamed, than the elevation of their own souls. The great purpose of Christianity—to unfold, and strengthen, and lift up the mind—has been perpetually thrown out of sight. In truth, this purpose has been more than overlooked. It has been reversed. The very religion, given to exalt human nature, has been used to make it abject. The very religion which was given to create a generous hope, has been made an instrument of servile and torturing fear. The very religion which came from God's goodness, to enlarge the human soul with a kindred goodness, has been employed to narrow it to a sect, to rear the Inquisition, and to kindle fires for the martyr. The very religion given to make the understanding and conscience free, has, by a criminal perversion, served to break them into subjection to priests, ministers, and human creeds. Ambition and craft have seized on the solemn doctrines of an omnipotent God, and of future punishment, and turned them into engines against the child, the trembling female, the ignorant adult, until the sceptic has been emboldened to charge on religion the chief miseries and degradation of human nature. It is from a deep and sorrowful conviction

of the injuries inflicted on Christianity, and on the human soul, by these perversions and errors, that I have reiterated the great truth of this discourse. I would rescue our holy faith from this dishonour. Christianity has no tendency to break the human spirit, or to make man a slave. It has another aim; and as far as it is understood, it puts forth another power. God sent it from heaven, Christ sealed it with his blood, that it might give force of thought and purpose to the human mind, might free it from all fear but the fear of wrong doing, might make it free of its fellow beings, might break from it every outward and inward chain.

My hearers, I close with exhorting you to remember this great purpose of our religion. Receive Christianity as given to raise you in the scale of spiritual being. Expect from it no good any farther than it gives strength and worth to your characters. Think not, as some seem to think, that Christ has a higher gift than purity to bestow, even pardon to the sinner. He does bring pardon. But once separate the idea of pardon from purity; once imagine that forgiveness is possible to him who does not forsake sin; once make it an exemption from outward punishment, and not the admission of the reformed mind to favour and communion with God; and the doctrine of pardon becomes your peril, and a system, so teaching it, is fraught with evil. Expect no good from Christ any farther than you are exalted by his character and teaching. Expect nothing from his cross, unless a power comes from it, strengthening you to "bear his cross," to "drink his cup," with his own unconquerable love. This is its highest influence. Look not abroad for the blessings of Christ. His reign and chief blessings are within you. The human soul is his kingdom. There he gains his victories, there rears his temples, there lavishes his treasures. His noblest monument is a mind, redeemed from iniquity, brought back and devoted to God, forming itself after the perfection of the Saviour, great through its power to suffer for truth, lovely through its meek and gentle virtues. No other monument does Christ desire; for this will endure and increase in splendour, when earthly thrones shall have fallen, and even when the present order of the outward universe shall have accomplished its work, and shall have passed away.

To the Editor of the Christian Pioneer.

SIR,

THE annual meeting of the Edinburgh Bible Society has given rise to a few reflections, which you may perhaps be inclined to insert in the Pioneer, with the view of exciting attention to the spirit and the proceedings of such societies. In the success of Bible societies, the public have felt a strong and lively interest. An extensive distribution of the Scriptures must do good. The union of Christians for the accomplishment of this end, might be rendered as beneficial to themselves as to those who are the objects of their solicitude and bounty.

The public have heard even to satiety, the alleged grounds on which the Edinburgh Society has separated from the British and Foreign. Some of the accusations against the London Society, are grossly exaggerated; or else a large body of professed Christians and ministers, who have held a distinguished place in public esteem, are so far from being fit persons to distribute the Bible, that it must be dishonoured by passing through the hands of men, who have yet to learn the first principles of Christian morality, and even common honesty. Without descending into the endless detail of those accusations, it is evident, that so bad is the spirit in which they are urged, that it disqualifies some of the accusers for credible witnesses, in all but the plainest matters of fact, independent of their testimony. They are obviously men to whom little or no regard is due, when they have recourse to conjectures as to the motives of their opponents, relate transactions which the public cannot fully investigate, or indulge themselves in any reflections on the piety or the moral character of others, which are not founded in unquestionable evidence.

The chief accusations against the British and Foreign Society are two: the distribution of the Apocrypha with the Bible, and the union in the Society, of Christians of various denominations. The London Society has committed an error, in the circulation of the Apocrypha. This error has been acknowledged and corrected. But the odium excited against them has caused a separation, and concession is rendered unavailing, by the animosity which is studiously fostered and perpetuated. That the prejudices of a considerable number of persons in Scotland, against the Parent Society, are real, is not to be questioned.

But that some of the leaders of the Edinburgh Society have determined, if possible, to render them incurable, is not less apparent.

If the Apocryphal question could have been satisfactorily adjusted, a plea for separation would have been found. The union of Christians of various denominations, in the London Society, would have been attractive and agreeable to many of the more moderate and liberal Calvinists in Scotland; but is far more odious and intolerable to the leaders of the Edinburgh Committee, than Bel and the Dragon, Tobias and his Dog, or even the fishy fume to the Devil, though his nostrils were so offended that he spread his wings for flight, and made but one stage from Ecbatane to Egypt. The discussion of Biblical subjects, which was the result of this union, was felt to be injurious to the most sacred of all causes—Intolerance. Under the dust and smoke raised by the Apocryphal contest, a select band of veterans advanced to the real point of attack—the union of Christians.

To be at the head of an independent society in the Northern Metropolis—to inspire it with all their own unbounded and inveterate prejudices—to direct its movements at their will—and to be regarded as the champions of a circulation of the pure Word of God—is the prize of their ambition.

It might be conceived, that a society ostensibly formed to circulate the Sacred Writings, might be contented with the end proposed, and that this would be more effectually accomplished, if steadily and exclusively pursued; and that Christians of various sects, and even men of defective moral character, might unite in distributing the Bible, if such were their real and single purpose. But facts render it apparent, that whatever might be the original purpose of the subscribers, the leading advocates of separation regard the distribution of the Scriptures as very subordinate to the propagation of Trinitarianism and Calvinism—to the suppression of inquiry, and the diffusion of bigotry.

The more liberal among the several denominations of Christians, are either subscribers who regret in silence the more violent proceedings of the Edinburgh Committee, or, appalled by the sentiments and language of the speakers, withhold their contributions, and retire in disgust. With some zealous young persons of both sexes, with a few benevolent Christians who are not to be deterred from

an attempt to do good, by the intemperance of those with whom they associate—with many others who find an amusement in hearing declamatory speeches, all the most intolerant professors of religion in Edinburgh and the vicinity seem to be collected in the Assembly-Room. Nearly an hour may be spent in reading the Annual Report. Three hours are engrossed by one speaker. About six hours are consumed, not in recommending the Bible, or in describing the happy effects of pure Christianity, but in accusations of the London Society—in railing against liberality of sentiment, and in denouncing all sects to whom the speakers think fit to deny the Christian name. In a word, the place of assembly is converted into a school, or rather a theatre of bigotry and intolerance. Nothing is more conspicuous or more worthy of attention, than a violent and constant effort of these declaimers, to check or prevent, if possible, all inquiry into the Canon, and the Inspiration of the Scriptures. Biblical criticism they discourage, as dangerous and pernicious. They evidently wish to substitute the authority of the Protestant Church for that of the Catholic Church. To throw a thin veil over the infallibility which they assume, they pretend that the Canon of Scripture is itself a subject of revelation. They can learn at once, from the Scriptures themselves, what books, chapters, verses, and single words, are genuine and inspired! The testimony of the early Christians, and the labours of Eusebius, Lardner, Jones, Michaelis, and Less, are superfluous! They have found a royal road to the knowledge of the Canon! The verbal inspiration of the Scriptures they assume, as admitting of no doubt, and precluding all inquiry. To the authorised Version they appeal on all occasions, as if that too were inspired. The preface to the Strasburgh Bible, by Professor Haffner, is the subject of the most unqualified invective, as infidel and execrable, designed to undermine the authority of the Scriptures, and even to turn them into ridicule. They affect theatrical starts of horror at the mention of his impiety, and fix on their auditors a look that demands sympathy with a heart that labours to disburden itself of feelings too big for utterance. They are obviously apprehensive, that intercourse with England, where even many Calvinists consider the verbal inspiration of the Bible as indefensible, may be pernicious; and wish to prevent all discussion of the subject from crossing the Border. In

the number of the Monthly Repository for December, 1826, you will find a letter of Dr. J. P. Smith, in vindication of Dr. Haffner; from which I shall make a few extracts, which may serve to illustrate the ingenuousness and candour which characterise the Edinburgh Committee. He says: "A gentleman, for whom I have for nearly thirty years felt and cherished high respect, has printed and published, concerning a distinguished Lutheran Divine, that he is a scoffer at religion, and an infidel; and that a small treatise written by that Divine, professedly as an assistance to the reading of the Bible, was intended to turn it into ridicule." These charges were thus brought in the most positive manner, and in a strong tone of mingled indignation and contempt, against the Rev. Isaac Haffner, D.D. Professor of Divinity in the University of Strasburgh, Minister of St. Nicholas' and Vice-President of the Bible Society in that city. "If Dr. Haffner is to be treated with scorn and insult, and his name stamped with the crime of ridiculing the Scriptures, while he is recommending their universal distribution, and of being a downright Deist, under the garb of a Christian minister, —if this be consonant with truth, wisdom, and justice, then it is our duty to apply similar language to the persons and writings of Watson and Paley, of Lardner and Priestley." "Under the strong impression of Dr. Haffner's speeches, I wrote a respectful letter to the author of the pamphlet before alluded to, expressing my doubts as to the correctness of his imputations, and earnestly begging the loan of the *Preface to the Bible*, upon which they are ostensibly founded. More than two months have elapsed, and my old friend has not yet favoured me with any reply." The author of the pamphlet is believed to be Mr. Haldane, one of the leaders of the Edinburgh Committee. Dr. Smith obtained the Preface, but not from Mr. Haldane, and says, he considers it "a valuable and interesting production." "Aletheia [the signature of the lady to whom Dr. Smith replies] refers for evidence [to support the charge against Dr. Haffner], to the Edinburgh pamphlet; but I can find no evidence at all there: I find only bold affirmations and heavy charges, resting upon anonymous authority. Of Dr. Haffner's private character, I certainly know nothing. One fact, however, I have derived from a source which I know to be pure and faithful:—In the days of revolutionary fury and terror, under

Robespierre, he suffered nearly a year's imprisonment, with the hourly expectation of being publicly beheaded; because he would not renounce the Christian religion; that is, because, with the strongest temptation to induce him, he would not declare himself to be—what Aletheia assures us he is—*an infidel!*" Notwithstanding this, the speaker against time, to whose speech of three hours I have before adverted, had no hesitation in denouncing Dr. Haffner as an infidel, and his preface as execrable; and was supported in his groundless and shameful or shameless invective, by the same Mr. Haldane! These gentlemen may well triumph in their allegations and arguments, as unanswerable. They are certainly endless. Is the London Society to be accused of employing infidels, to undermine while they distribute the Bible?—they have only to call Professor Haffner, or any other eminent scholar, an infidel, on anonymous authority or none, and to extend the calumny to all who dare doubt or dispute their assertions! Human life is too precious to be wasted on men whose lungs are of brass, who blot whole reams of paper with verbiage and scandal, and whose consciences are under no visible restraint of truth or charity. It is much to be regretted, that Professor Haffner's Preface, with notes and comments, has not been rendered accessible to the public in Scotland, that they might form their own judgment of a production, which Dr. Smith, an impartial judge in this instance, considers as calumniated.

(To be Concluded in our next.)

Notes on Passages of Scripture.

"It is my earnest wish and prayer, that, by a more general cultivation of Biblical criticism, the lovers of the Scriptures may better understand and more deeply admire them."—*Newcome.*

Job vii. 21. "Why dost thou not pardon my transgression, and take away mine iniquity?"

In the original, the word here rendered *pardon*, is precisely the same with what occurs in the first clause of the 4th verse of Isaiah liii: "Surely he hath BORNE [away] our griefs."* The Supreme Being *pardons* sin, when he

* See Mat. viii. 16, 17; Dodson's Translation of Isaiah, Preface, p. 5, note; and Christian Pioneer, vol. ii. p. 289, 290. To *bear* and to *bear away*, are not always the same acts. Compare the above passage in Job, with Is. xl. 15, lxiii. 9; and see a shorter form of words in Is. ii. 9.

removes the guilt, when he remits the punishment of it; and this idea is conveyed by such phrases as, *bearing away transgression, taking away iniquity.* But has not the Hebrew verb before us a very different meaning in some other passages; for example, in Lev. xxiv. 15, Ezek. xviii. 20, &c.? Certainly; in that class of texts, the noun, or the preposition, with which the term is combined, will point out and explain its import. It enters into many an idiom of the language; and the lexicographers have assigned to it, as I conceive, a greater variety of distinct senses than it really admits.

PSAL. xlvi. 10. "Be still, and know that I am God."

This is the address of Jehovah to the discomfited heathens. His victory over them, is described in the foregoing verses; and they are now called upon to *cease* from their hostility. Mudge's translation of the clause is significant, but not sufficiently dignified—"Stand off." The thought introduced, is that of "*relaxed* efforts."* Most of the translators so exhibit it: among these, Mendelssohn, for his rendering, and Diodati, for his annotation, claim our particular regard.

It is without reason, and in defiance of taste, that Green and others add such words as *saying, Jehovah saith.* We are far more deeply impressed by the passage in the Hebrew and in the English Bible.—See Jer. vi. 17, in Blayney's Translation and Notes.

ECCLES. xii. 11. "The words of the wise are as goads, and as nails fastened by the masters of assemblies, which are given from one shepherd."

To discern the leading thought in this verse, is not difficult. The proverbs and sayings of the Eastern teachers —"the words of the wise," especially of Solomon—are characterised at once by pungency and by firm impression; by their hold on the memory, the judgment, and the feelings. Like *goads* applied to oxen, like the large oriental *nails* fastened in the walls or in the ground, they excite to reflection and action, and fix themselves indelibly in the mind.†

But who are "the masters of assemblies," and what is signified by the clause, "which are given from one shepherd"? For a reply to these questions, we must examine

* Nehem. vi. 3; Ps. xxxvii. 8; Ezek. vii. 17; Zeph. iii. 16.

† Bishop Lowth's Lectures on Hebrew Poetry (Gregory's Transl.) No. xxiv. Vol. ii. 67, 68. [2d Ed.]

how far the verse is justly translated, and what is its connection—what its reference?

> "The words of the wise are as goads,
> And as nails planted:* [firmly fixed]
> The masters of assemblies give *them*
> From one shepherd."

I have endeavoured to present the reader with a literal and correct rendering, and to avoid the imputation of being paraphrastical. Who, then, I repeat, are "the masters of assemblies"? My answer is, the presidents of those social meetings for intellectual and moral improvement, which have always been so much in vogue among the people of the East.† It must be further asked, Who is intended by "one shepherd"? I reply, *Solomon*, or some distinguished aphoristical teacher and collector like Solomon,‡ from whose copious stores, maxims of life and manners were produced, recited, and illustrated at such meetings. Thus viewed, the verse is a concise, figurative, and animated description of the book denominated *Ecclesiastes*. The *shepherd* and the *instructor*, are sometimes, in Hebrew, synonymous appellations. To *feed* is to *instruct*.§

May it not be probable, that the *editor* of *Ecclesiastes*, whoever he was, added the last six verses of the twelfth chapter? There would be a striking pertinency in the author himself—"the preacher"—concluding with the sentiment with which the book opens [ver. 8, compared with chap. i. 2].

Luke v. 10. "From henceforth thou shalt catch men."

The preceding Evangelists record this declaration in rather different language, "I will make you fishers of men."‖ In Luke, as might be expected, a somewhat more classical phraseology occurs, "thou shalt catch men alive." [ανθρωπους εση ζωγρων.] Thus, in Thucyd. Hist. &c. iii. §. 66, we read, ζωγρησαντες;¶ precisely in the sense of "taking captives in war."

---

* See Jer. xlii. 10; Dan. xi. 45.

† See Harmer's intelligent observation, No. 127, Vol. iv. p. 70, &c. [1787].

‡ "Sermo est de eo, qui jussit colligi proverbia, hoc est, de Solomone."—*Le Clerc, in loc.*

§ Prov. x. 21; Jer. iii. 15. If the Hebrew word that we render *assemblies* be translated *collections*, viz. of proverbial sayings [see Michaelis, Suppl. &c. i. p. 108], the meaning of the passage will still be substantially the same.

‖ Mat. iv. 19; Mark i. 17.

¶ I had noticed this example, long before I met with it in Schleusner's Lexicon, &c.

Luke vii. 37. "Behold, a woman in the city," &c.

This woman was not *Mary of Magdala*, although she is so called in the title prefixed to the chapter by the translators, and although *Muretus** has countenanced the common error on this point, which Dr. Lardner† has illustrated with the greatest perspicuity and success.

Luke xii. 35. "Let your loins be girded about."

It is well known, that the Greeks and Romans, as well as the Hebrews, employ this image to express *unencumbered preparation, diligence, and activity*. So, in Thucyd. Hist. L. ii. § 97, we have, ανηρ ευζωνος.

Luke xviii. 11. "The Pharisee stood," &c.

This seems to have been the posture of prayer, among the Jews, in the temple and other public spots. Accordingly, in Mark xi. 25, our Saviour's language is, "when ye STAND praying." Hence, too, we illustrate Jer. xv. 1,‡ "Though Moses and Samuel STOOD before me," *i. e.* "stood praying, or interceding, before me."

Philip. ii. 8. "He humbled himself."

In commenting on these words, Archbishop Newcome§ is pleased to add "[still more];" whereas, the passage describes one, and only one—grand act of humiliation, *viz.* our Saviour's destitute outward condition, as the result of his faithful application of his miraculous powers. N.

August 30, 1828.

Unitarian Worthies.—No. 4, *Theophilus Lindsey.*

"Champion of Truth, alike through Nature's field,
And where, in Sacred leaves, she shines reveal'd,—
Pour thy free spirit o'er the breathing page,
And wake the virtue of a careless age."

The Rev. Theophilus Lindsey was born at Middlewich in Cheshire, June 20th, 1723, *O. S.* He was named after his godfather, Theophilus, Earl of Huntingdon, the husband of Selina, Countess of Huntingdon, so well known as the zealous and liberal patroness of Mr. Whitfield and the Calvinistic Methodists. At a proper age, he was placed in the Grammar-School at Leeds, then under the superintendence of Mr. Barnard. To the instructions and

* Opera [ed. Ruhnken], Vol. ii. L. xvi. C. vi.

† Works (1788) xi. page 253, &c.

‡ Jer. xviii. 20, is another example of this mode of speaking and writing.

§ Observations, &c. P. 400.

influences to which he was here subjected, in concurrence with the impressions of his earlier domestic education, Mr. Lindsey was indebted for that ardent love of truth, that firm integrity, that purity of spirit, that early and deeply rooted principle of piety, by which he was so eminently distinguished. At the eighteenth year of his age, Mr. L. was admitted at St. John's College, Cambridge. Here his literary attainments and exemplary conduct soon attracted general notice and admiration. Having passed through his academical course, and taken his degree with high reputation, Mr. Lindsey was elected a fellow of St. John's College; and, had he chosen to devote himself to literary pursuits, he was well qualified to have attained considerable distinction, but his chief ambition was to be a minister of the Gospel. After several changes, he succeeded to the living of Piddletown in Dorsetshire. While he was minister of this Parish, he married, Sept. 29th, 1760, Miss Elsworth, the step-daughter of Archdeacon Blackburne, the celebrated author of the Confessional; a lady, whose principles and views were congenial with his own; whose superior understanding and exalted virtues were eminently calculated to aid and second him in all his schemes for the temporal and spiritual benefit of his parishioners, and especially of the poor and ignorant.

It was while Mr. Lindsey resided at Piddletown, that he first began to entertain serious scruples concerning the Scripture warrant for Trinitarian worship, and the lawfulness of his continuing to officiate in the Established Church. After learned, calm, and diligent inquiries, he says, "the more I searched, the more I saw the little foundation there was for the doctrine commonly received and interwoven with all the public devotions of the Church, and could not but be disturbed at a discovery so ill suiting my situation. For, in the end, I became fully persuaded, to use Paul's express words, 1 Cor. viii. 6, "That there is but one God, the Father," and he alone to be worshipped. This appeared to be the uniform unvaried language and practice of the Bible throughout; and I found the sentiments and practice of Christians in the first and best ages corresponding with it." Mr. L. did not however immediately leave the Church: an affair of such moment, required, he thought, and rightly, much and mature consideration. At the same time, he declined an offer which, in all probability, would have led him to the Episcopal bench of the Church of Ire-

land. Mr. Lindsey was greatly desirous of residing in Yorkshire, where he might enjoy the society and counsel of many valuable friends, and particularly of the venerable Archdeacon Blackburne. He accordingly exchanged his living for that of Catterick, a benefice in every respect inferior to that of Piddletown. Mr. L. had now renounced the doctrine of the Trinity; yet he remained in the Church. He himself has stated the reasons. He had been devoted to, and early educated for, the Christian ministry; his heart was engaged in the service, and he was reluctant to leave a situation of usefulness. This reluctance was increased, and its impropriety rendered less evident, by the silence which prevailed respecting Unitarianism—the singularity of quitting the Church on such grounds—the example of other estimable persons, who, though their opinions varied little from his, satisfied themselves to remain in the Church—the dissuasion of friends, who told him that he ought not to leave his benefice merely, but the world, if he expected a perfect state of things in which there was no flaw or hardship; and that, in the mean time, he had it in his power to forward the desired work, by preparing men's minds for it, whenever there should be a disposition in the state to rectify what was amiss. If, therefore, he could find any way of interpretation, so as to reconcile the prescribed forms with Scripture, he was not only justified, but to be commended. These considerations influenced him; and he brought himself to consider the Trinitarian forms in the service, as a threefold representation of the One God. This hypothesis was advanced by the learned Dr. Wallis, and sanctioned by the University of Oxford. He took all opportunities, however, both in public and in private, to bear his testimony to this great truth—that there is but One God, the Father—with great plainness, and without reserve. However plausible these arguments, they were not likely to maintain a permanent ascendancy over the honourable, ingenuous, and inquiring mind of this excellent man; and in his Apology for resigning his living in the Church, he frankly, and with great humility acknowledges their invalidity, and his own infirmity in yielding to them.

At length, he resolved to quit the Church communion; though he expected that his means of usefulness would be greatly diminished, if not annihilated—though his principles and person, would, among the great body of the

dissenters, be regarded with horror; and few were the congregations, at that time of day, though they called themselves rational and liberal, who would endure to hear the pure Unitarian doctrine. But none of these things moved him; he fixed his eye upon the line of duty, and determined closely to adhere to it, and to leave the event to God. On announcing his resolution to his friends, the most dear and intimate opposed it the most; they urged upon him the state of poverty to which he would reduce himself and family; but in vain. In obedience to the voice of enlightened conscience, Mr. and Mrs. Lindsey resigned their beloved residence at Catterick, with all its secular advantages and comforts—with all its means of usefulness; and, with the smallest pittance of private property, set out in the bleak month of December, in search of a resting-place, where they might be able to maintain themselves by honourable industry, and might best promote the great doctrine of the Divine Unity, and the sole and unrivalled supremacy of the Father.

> The world was all before them, where to choose
> Their place of rest; and Providence their guide.

The diminution of their income was not their only difficulty. Former friends looked coldly on them, and some from whom better things might have been expected, were not sparing in loud and strong expressions of disapprobation; and not a few were willing to leave them to their fate. Some, indeed, of Mrs. Lindsey's more opulent relations, offered to provide for her an asylum and competence, if she would abandon the society and the fortunes of her husband. It is needless to say that such a proposal was rejected with the indignation it deserved. As a means of temporary supply, Mr. Lindsey sold his library; a sacrifice, the value of which none can appreciate, but those who have an ingenuous love of literature. It was now, that Mr. Lindsey published his Apology; the design of this excellent treatise, as set forth in the preface, "was not barely to offer a vindication of the motives, conduct, and sentiments of a private person upon the subject of it, however important to him, but to promote that charity, without which a faith that can remove mountains is nothing, and to excite some to piety, virtue, and integrity." Arrived in London, they provided themselves with decent but humble lodgings, and sold their plate to purchase necessaries for present subsistence.

(To be Continued.)

REVIEW.

Memoirs of the Life, Writings, and Opinions, of the Rev. S. Parr, LL.D. by the Rev. W. Field.—Vol. 2.

The publication of the second volume of this interesting memoir, leads us to resume the notice of the work which we took in No. XIX. p. 235, and to place before our readers, fresh instances of the largeness and liberality of soul, the justness of sentiment, and the vigour of intellect, by which Dr. Parr was so eminently distinguished.

July 10th, 1813, is a day which deserves to be marked with honourable distinction in the history of religious toleration; as, on that day, one of the most cruelly persecuting statutes, which had too long disgraced the British code, received its death-blow; and the royal assent was given to an act repealing all laws passed in ages of ignorant bigotry, against those Christians who impugn the doctrine of the Trinity. On that occasion, Dr. Parr offered to his biographer, Mr. Field, as one benefited by that act of public justice, the most sincere and heartfelt congratulations. "Even the very manner of passing the act," says Dr. Parr, "increases my satisfaction; because it seems to declare the state of public feeling no less remarkably than the act itself." The manner alluded to, consisted in the fact, that the bill appeared to be passed by the unanimous concurrence both of the Church and the State, and, without the slightest whisper of objection, was allowed to pass into a law.

Occasionally, we are informed by Mr. Field, Dr. Parr took upon himself to address letters of remonstrance or reproof, to the zealous theologian, or to the controversial writer who had offended against the precepts of Christian charity. Of this, an instance occurred in the case of the great Unitarian opponent, the Lord Archbishop of Dublin. To that high dignitary, he twice presented a protest against the unfairness of reasoning, the rashness of assertion, and the bitterness of invective which have dishonoured his Lordship's polemical writings.

On an occasion of dining with several clergymen, when an Irish dignitary present had talked long and loudly of "our excellent church," of "our venerable establishment," in which he could discover no defect, Dr. Parr, disgusted with such shallow pretensions, burst into a strain of the most vehement invective against the grievances under

which "it was sick, though he hoped not dying;" especially, in the unequal distribution of its revenues—the mysticism of some parts of its creed—the absurdity of some of its articles—the servile spirit too prevalent both among its higher and lower clergy, and their obstinate resistance to the most reasonable and desirable improvements. "Reform," he continued, "is the only safety for the church. I give you your choice—Reform or Ruin; and mark my words, within twenty years, that choice, whichever it be, must take effect." We remark, however, *en passant*, that though an enemy to the errors of the church, Dr. Parr was a friend to establishments; and this sentiment, doubtless, had great weight in inducing him to remain in communion with a church whose doctrine he mainly discarded, and whose discipline he in many points impugned.

To his Royal Highness the Duke of Sussex, Dr. Parr was greatly attached; and has borne most honourable testimony to the cultivation of that Royal personage's understanding, his exalted spirit, and his truly constitutional principles. On his part, the Duke has proclaimed his high regard for this eminent scholar, by placing in his noble library at Kensington, the portrait of Dr. Parr; and what perhaps will still more please our readers, in juxta position, and as a companion picture, the likeness of a venerable Unitarian, the friend of Dr. Parr, namely, Dr. Rees. On the occasion of some surprise and pleasure being expressed, at seeing, in his library, the portrait of a divine not of the national church, the liberal and enlightened prince, speaking with fervour, exclaimed, "I love that good old Non-con.!" Dr. Parr was, from the first, a firm friend of the persecuted Queen Caroline; his services he tendered to her, when too many, fitted by their station and learning to support her, kept aloof; and he refused acquiescence in the order of the Government, for the omission of her name in the Liturgy, considering it as unwise, unjust, and illegal. Her name, indeed, he could not pronounce; but, said he, "I shall, in the secret recesses of my soul, recommend her to the protection of the Deity." Against the omission of her name, however, he entered in the Prayer Book, used in his church at Hatton, a solemn protest; and as the council, by a strange oversight, did not extend their regulation to what is called the *bidding* prayer, he there introduced her name. Once,

when dining at Mr. Field's, in company with several Unitarian divines, Dr. Rees, with a sort of challenge, defended the views which he took of the person of Christ, which were what are called Arian; hereupon, Dr. Parr maintained in opposition to him, and with a skill that secured the victory, the sentiments of Unitarians.

To the late Dr. James Lindsay of Monkwell-Street Chapel, London, Dr. Parr was warmly attached; and when on one occasion he had heard him preach in the Unitarian Chapel at Warwick, on the character of the beloved disciple, he said to a friend on leaving the chapel, "This is true Christianity." Beyond the bigotry of that clergyman mentioned by Dr. Watson, who said, "I never read dissenting divinity," Dr. Parr read and even heard the divines of other communions, and especially the Unitarian. Some years ago, he attended the service in the Cross-Street Chapel, Manchester: happening to dine with a bigot—"Where," said the Church of England-man, "will you go next, Doctor?" "Why, Sir, if I remember," replied he, "and practically regard what I have heard this morning, the place I shall go to last, if not next, is *Heaven*." Dr. Parr was one of those who considered dissent as a good, rather than an evil, and who acknowledged in the various classes of dissenters, instead of enemies, useful auxiliaries of the church. He thought that the church owed much obligation to dissenting divines, for their many able defences of Christianity, and even for objections against the establishment, because well-founded objection is sure at last to produce conviction, and conviction, amendment and improvement. In his last will, he has recorded his assurances of kind and respectful regards to more than thirty individuals not of his own church; among them are the following Unitarian ministers:—Dr. Rees, Dr. Lindsay, Mr. Belsham, Mr. Cogan, Mr. Shepherd, Mr. Corrie, Mr. Field. On the death of Dr. Lindsay, who died four years before Dr. Parr, speaking to Mr. Field in a tone of deep-felt grief, "Ah!" said he, "our friend Lindsay is gone! Oh! he was a noble creature!—we shall long remember him, long mourn his loss." Several other Unitarian divines he knew and highly esteemed, of whom we may name the Rev. C. Berry of Leicester, the late Mr. Hawkes of Mosley-Street, Manchester, the Rev. James Yates, the opponent of Dr. Wardlaw.

(To be concluded in our next.)

THE CHRISTIAN PIONEER.

GLASGOW, *October* 1, 1828.

Methodist Schism and Methodist Persecution.—We are happy to have reason to believe, that the body of Methodists in these kingdoms, is rapidly approaching to two extremes—namely, those who recognise and rejoice in the great principles of Civil and Religious Liberty, in all their amplitude; and those, who, trained by the discipline of the travelling preachers, and passive recipients of the spirit which the Conference labours to diffuse, avoid all contact with the persons or the productions of those who think for themselves, and all inquiry into the foundations of their own opinions and practices, and of the regimen under which they live. We are glad, we say, that things are approaching to this state, because, in an age like the present, the result cannot be dubious or even tardy. But, why do we wish the downfal of Methodism? Because, we see in it, as governed and directed by the Conference, a palpable and shameless infringement of Civil and Religious Liberty—the essence of a system, which, if it be permitted to develope its strength, will prove as heavy and oppressive a burden to myriads, as ever was imposed by the Papal Hierarchy. Because, we see in it also, an interest adverse to the interests of Non-Conformity, now most prejudicial, and threatening to become more powerful and injurious, undermining dissent in its hitherto strong and impregnable position—the affections of the middle and labouring classes of society. That Methodism has effected much good among the depraved and ignorant, we willingly grant; but this cannot and ought not to close our eyes to the real spirit and tendency of the system. We hope, however, that better days are coming. Even of those who remain in communion with the Conference, there are many malcontents, and those, too, the most vigorous and useful men that the Society can boast, whilst several schisms, such as those of Alexander Kilham, or the New Connexion, the Primitive Methodists, &c. have already taken place, and chiefly on the ground of an infringement of Christian Liberty. A more recent instance we have now to record. The facts are as follows:—

When subscriptions were solicited towards the erection of the Brunswick Chapel in Leeds, in several instances pledges were given, that neither an organ nor the Church of England service was intended to be introduced. In a few months, however, after the Chapel was opened, two persons were employed by one or two of the Trustees, to obtain signatures to a petition from the seat-holders, to request the Trustees to purchase an organ. They obtained 76 signatures to the petition, 45 of which were from persons who were *not members of Society;* so that, in fact, the Trustees were the originators of the business, and the petition got up by themselves to themselves, only contained the names of 31

Methodist members, and even some of these signed it with very great reluctance. A Meeting of the Trustees was called, to consider the propriety of acceding to such a petition. About two-thirds were present, when there were 8 for an organ, 6 against it, and 1 neuter, so that there was only a majority of 2 in favour of it. The Superintendent, himself an officer of Conference, determined that the sanction of a Leader's meeting was necessary before such a measure could be adopted. A Leader's Meeting was called, and resolutions *against* an organ were passed with only one dissenting voice. Notwithstanding this strong manifestation of the views and feelings of the Society, the Trustees applied to the District Meeting, when it was declared, that no organ ought to be erected, by a majority of 13 to 7. According to a rule of Conference, this decision should have been conclusive of the question at issue. But the few Trustees who were desirous of erecting an organ, and without consulting the other 17 Trustees, appealed to Conference.

This appeal, Conference entertained in open violation of their own rule, and in direct opposition to the voice of the congregation, thereby assuming a power odious to Britons,—that of dispensing with rules at pleasure, which being a species of *ex post facto* law, includes in it the very essence of despotism. The Conference appointed a Committee to hear the case, and the Committee recommended the reversal of the decision of the District Meeting. A deputation from the Congregation, pressed for the rescinding of these illegal and arbitrary proceedings. They were met by new claims of authority; being told by the Rev. Messrs. Bunting and Watson, that the right of regulating public worship in Methodist Chapels, belonged only to the Superintendent Preacher in each Circuit, who was accountable for his acts to the Conference alone, and that not only an organ, but the Liturgy likewise, ought to be introduced into the Chapel, whenever an opportunity offered; thus, by one sweeping assumption, rendering Trustees, Stewards, Leaders, and, of course, the People—for they have nothing to do, but *give*—mere ciphers, as to some of the most important parts of the Methodist economy. He must be something more or less than man, who would not endeavour to arrest in the outset, so boldly a declared intention, to grasp at a degree of power totally at variance with the New Testament, and which experience has abundantly proved, cannot be safely entrusted to human beings. The preachers aforetime, combined in themselves the Clerical, the Legislative, the Judicial, and the Executive characters. They were the ministers of the connexion, the makers, the expounders, and administrators of its laws; and now they assume the right of setting aside these laws at pleasure, and acting by their own mere will. Resistance became an imperative duty.

But how could the malcontents resist? The rules of Conference forbade all co-operation on the part of the people, by prohibiting the holding of Meetings for consultation on any measure, unless they had first received the approbation of themselves, through their servant and organ, the Superintendent. How resist? when the same rules interdict all appeal to the Connexion through the

press, by enacting, that "It shall not be lawful, by publications, public meetings, or otherwise, to make *any* rule of *Conference* a cause of contention." What monstrous tyranny!

Meetings of the Leaders and Local Preachers, were however held. On this, the Superintendent, Mr. Grindrod (appropriate name!) suspended one of the most active and efficient of the Dissentients, a Local Preacher, though it was shown him, that he had no power to do so without the concurrence of his brethren, who strongly opposed the measure. A special District meeting, consisting of *travelling Preachers only*, was then assembled in Leeds. The rules of the Methodist denomination were again violated, in order to secure the presence of some who were known to be friendly to arbitrary measures, namely, Mr. Bunting and Mr. Newton. Instead of making up differences, the Meeting proceeded to the trial of the Dissentients. The charge—factious conduct in attending illegal Meetings. Mindful enough of their laws, it seems, when they would serve the purpose of oppression, when wielded against popular rights. And mark, how sentence was secured before evidence had been heard. Certain resolutions were produced, which involved the condemnation of the accused parties; and it was declared, that those who refused to sign the document, would not be allowed either to vote, or even to speak, on the occasion. This was carried into effect. The result, as might be expected, was, that the two most obnoxious individuals were expelled from the Methodist connexion. Again was the document produced, in order to cleanse, still further, this immaculate body, when between 30 and 40 persons, Local Preachers and Leaders mostly, were, contrary to all the laws and usages of Methodism, to say nothing of common justice and Christian freedom, excluded from Methodist communion.

During these singular proceedings, several things fell from the lips of speakers, which show the high tone they assumed—their fixed resolution to maintain, at all risks, the authority of Conference, and the lofty pretensions of the Methodist Priesthood. Mr. Bunting remarked, in allusion to a minute of Conference, prohibiting the use of the title Reverend, that those were days of ignorance, when the persons referred to were merely Methodist Preachers, and not Pastors and Ministers, as they are now! The same person remarked, that the office of President of the Conference, was of far greater importance than that of Archbishop of Canterbury! That with regard to the blame attached to the Trustees for getting up the requisition for an organ, their crime consisted in having consulted the people at all; for that Methodism was as much opposed to Democracy as to Sin! Good. We thank the Reverend Gentleman for this admission. We believe it firmly. We have always looked upon Methodism as the modern Babylon. We knew that the people under its empire, had no other privilege than that of ever-ready compliance with the calls of those, whose cry, like that of the horse-leech's daughter, is for ever and aye, Give, give. We were aware, that as to mind and opinion, like members of more vaunted establishments, the individual joining its communion was required to write "SLAVE" on his intellectual

faculties. And truly we have often marvelled much, that those who so constantly sound the tocsin of alarm and horror, at the power of him of Rome and his subordinate clergy, should be quite unmindful of the growing strength and spiritual intolerance of that Protestant Popery, which aims to bestride the land. "The wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God." Mr. Bunting in his wrath, has lifted up the veil, and disclosed to us the purposes of the inner sanctuary. His remarks, are a fine illustration of the idea said to be entertained by certain of his sect, to adorn themselves with the title of Bishops. They already, it seems, possess the power—*that* we look upon as the people's grievance and Religion's deterioration; the name in itself considered, is harmless as any other title or toy. We do, however, call upon the Methodists—as they value their own intellectual advancement, their rights and privileges as Christians, and the purity of the blessed Gospel—to withstand those who lord it over God's heritage, and no longer degrade themselves by a vassalage as real, if not more so, than that of the Roman Catholic, whose ritual they despise, and whose civil rights they aid in withholding.

The Dissentients, not having found the reparation they had a right to expect at the hands of the District Meeting, but, on the contrary, having suffered injury upon injury, made an appeal to the body at large, through the press, praying them to unite with the aggrieved parties, in remonstrating with Conference against such an odious assumption of authority. From this further appeal to Conference, nothing could be expected, though the persisting in such measures, may and indeed must tend to destroy the only foundation of the power of the Preachers, by destroying respect for their character. Yet, it was not likely they would pronounce their own condemnation. Accordingly, we find, that the Conference, so far from having redressed the wrongs of the nonconformists, have confirmed the obnoxious measures, and even appointed to the highest stations in the denomination, the two individuals, who, by their arbitrary spirit, have lost all influence, to say the least, with the Dissentients—Mr. Bunting appointed President, Mr. Newton, Secretary. The appointment of the first especially (being, according to his own assertions, something more than an archbishop, we believe the next grade in the hierarchy to be either Cardinal or Pope), is little less than an insult to those who had previously enough of grievances. Accordingly, the Dissentients speak of that person in the following terms: "The unwarrantable assumption of power on the part of Mr. Bunting (to the great grief of many of the *travelling preachers*, as well as of the people), has of late excited extreme dissatisfaction and alarm, and must necessarily occasion discord and disunion in the Methodist Societies in general."

Disappointed in all their endeavours to obtain redress, and unable to reconcile to their consciences their remaining with the society, both those who were, and those who were not expelled of the Dissentients, intend to form a distinct body, and will shortly invite their friends in different parts of the kingdom to meet them, in order to take into consideration the best means of pro-

moting general co-operation. In their contest with spiritual arrogance, and spiritual despotism—in their advocacy of that liberty wherewith the Saviour has made all his disciples free, we wish them, with all our heart, God speed. And we are sure, every true friend to the rights of man, and to the prevalence of Christian freedom, will respond to that wish—Amen.

In conclusion, we have to mention another instance of Methodistical tyranny. It is a shameless attempt to stifle the inquiry which is roused, into the character and conduct of the Conference. We doubt not, however, that such attempts are no less ill-timed than they are hateful and arbitrary. The fact we allude to is, that "*the Imperial Magazine*" has been excommunicated by the Conference, for the unpardonable sin, of having inserted, merely as an advertisement, a statement of the complaints of the Dissentients at Leeds. This respectable miscellany had been supplied to Methodist subscribers through the Methodist Book Society. But, no sooner did it, in the equal administration of justice, allow the Dissentients to be heard in their own behalf, than it was put under the ban of the Priesthood, being excluded from the Society. We presume, that this was done after the advice of the Priest of old—"We must destroy the Press, or the Press will destroy us;" we must shut out the light of conviction, otherwise it will reprove our deeds of darkness. But the age of the *Index Expurgatorius*, and of the Bulls of Papacy, is past. Mr. Bunting, and his coadjutors in the holy war of Methodistic supremacy, may assure themselves they are come a day too late; and if this be the "great work"* which, in his supercilious reply to Mr. Beard of Salford, Mr. Bunting asserted he was "doing," we are disposed to think, that the sooner he lets the "work cease," the better for his own character and the reputation of Methodism; otherwise, probably he may at no distant period learn, to his confusion, "Othello's occupation's gone!"

American Unitarian Quakers—Gross Mis-statement.—THE following paragraph is taken from the Congregational Magazine for the month of August:—

"We learned from private sources of information, some time since, the painful fact, that a large part of the Quaker Society in New England, *have abandoned the doctrines of Revelation, and embraced Deistical opinions.* As this change has now become the subject of newspaper intelligence, both in Germany and England, we record the circumstances which have come to our knowledge. Elias Hickes, an aged and influential minister amongst the Friends, has been the author of this defection, which has terminated in a complete separation in the Society. He unhesitatingly avows, in his public labours, *sentiments which are subversive of Christianity.*" There then follows more of a similar nature.

We assure our readers, that the writer of the above notice is either a gross deceiver, or is grossly deceived. The facts are simply

---

* Christian Pioneer, Vol. II. p. 195.

these. A large portion of the Quakers of America, have seceded from the rest of the community of Friends, on the question of religious liberty and the right of private judgment, and in the exercise of their inalienable privileges, have adopted opinions held in the better days of Quakerism by many of their leading men—we mean the fundamental tenets of Unitarianism, that the Father is the Only God, and Jesus Christ his Son and Servant. This is the doctrine to the promotion of which the truly venerable Elias Hickes devotes himself. In proof of our assertions, we appeal to the authorised statements of the dissentients—particularly an address issued by them, to the Quakers of New England at large. If the explicit statements which this document contains, did not expose the misrepresentations of the Congregational Magazine, we might adduce also the epistle of the orthodox remnant, who, in their answer, never as much as imply that the seceders have abandoned the path of Christianity. We fear, that this gross misrepresentation has had its origin in a disinclination to acknowledge the rapid prevalence of Unitarian Christianity in America. In a similar manner, have the advocates of reputed orthodoxy, at their public meetings, in their reports and magazines, attempted to conceal the truth, by representing that as the triumph of infidelity on the Continent of Europe, which is, in many instances, the triumph of Unitarianism. But the real fact is too obvious to be concealed; and all attempts to keep it from the public eye, will, in the end, accelerate the cause against which they marshal every band, no matter whether accustomed to fair or foul warfare. And knowing, as many of them must know, that what they call the progress of infidelity, is the progress of Unitarianism, they must feel an especial bitterness against the tenets we profess, when they would misrepresent—to do what? to record the progress of the true faith? no!—to herald the successes of a system which describes Christ as an imposter, and his followers as fanatics. To what absurdities will not the unholy passion of bigotry lead! However, we would have the editor of the Congregational Magazine, and all others of his spirit, to know, that Unitarianism has been numbering, and is still numbering, its conquests in America—not of hundreds, but of hundreds of thousands, amongst those who approach more nearly to them in sentiment than the Society of Friends. And, except the editor and his friends have better weapons than misrepresentation to wield, they will find, even in their own borders—where error has so many adventitious aids—that they will have to record or to misrepresent more and greater defections from their own ranks to those of Unitarians, than they now imagine or apprehend. G. C. S.

British and Foreign Unitarian Association.—The Third Annual Report of this Society, read at the Anniversary Meeting in London, 28th May last, has been lately published. At that meeting, the devotional portion of the service was conducted by the Rev. Dr. Philipps of Sheffield, and the sermon, since published, was delivered by the Rev. Dr. Hutton of Leeds. At the meeting for business, C. Richmond, Esq. was in the Chair, and at the dinner,

W. Smith, Esq. M. P. Among the Resolutions adopted, was the following:—"That no difference of religious opinions, however wide, can lessen the sensibility of this meeting to the liberal and generous support which they received, in the late application to Parliament, from the Roman Catholics of the United Kingdom; and that common gratitude would compel them to make in return, a tender of their best wishes on behalf of the claims of the Roman Catholics, for unrestricted and equal religious freedom, if they were not bound to aid, according to their means, the cause of these their fellow-subjects and fellow-Christians, by the still higher obligations of patriotism and religion,—believing as they do, in the sincerity of their minds, that the existing disqualifications, which aggrieve the British and Irish Roman Catholic population, are in open hostility to the peace, union, and prosperity of the kingdom, and are at the same time a sure hindrance to the progress of, and a violation of, and dishonour to, our common Christianity, which establishes no point of morality more plainly, nor commands any duty more solemnly, than that one Christian shall not make the condition of another more wretched or less happy on account of his faithful adherence to the dictates of his conscience and the law of his God."

We select from the Report, the following extract of a Letter from the Rev. W. Adam, the Unitarian Missionary at Calcutta:—

"I am succeeding beyond my own most sanguine expectations, in exciting the attention of the European, and, although in a less degree, of the native community also, to the claims of pure Christianity. I have commenced an evening service, which has been respectably and numerously attended; I say *numerously*, with reference to our expectations and to the congregations that usually assemble in Calcutta churches and chapels. The number of hearers or attendants on the Unitarian service, is from 60 to 80; but besides the mere attendance, there is a spirit of inquiry abroad, the effects of which I will not venture to anticipate. Several persons, formerly Trinitarians, have avowed themselves Unitarians; and within a month, our subscription list for general and incidental purposes, has risen from 30 or 40 rupees per month, to upwards of 150 rupees per month. The subject of the lectures is the doctrine of the Divine Unity, in all its aspects and relations, both to Trinitarianism, and to Polytheism and Idolatry; and I am happy to state, that, besides Rammohun Roy, and his son Radhaprusad Roy, there are several other educated and intelligent natives who regularly attend. For the exclusive benefit of the natives, however, I commenced, in October last, in the native part of the city, a course of familiar lectures on the first principles of religion, which has been attended by a congregation varying from 12 to 25. The interest felt by the natives respecting Unitarianism, is, I think, increasing, although only very gradually: last Sunday was the only occasion on which there were so many as 25 hearers; but this native congregation is different from those which are collected by orthodox missionaries, in several important respects. They have to stand at the side of the road, or at the door of their native chapel, and invite the people, who are passing, to stop and

hear them: the people who accept the invitation, are almost invariably ignorant and uneducated, and incapable of appreciating the doctrine that may be addressed to them. Thus invited, they seldom remain more than a few minutes, and are succeeded by others of the same character, and whose attendance is equally desultory and irreverent. Even in this way, the seeds of truth might be sown, if the simple and rational doctrines of the Gospel were taught; but the advantages of communicating religious instruction, are undoubtedly much greater, when I have, as at present, a small but intelligent and respectable congregation of natives, all of whom understand English, and almost all have received an English education, who attend from Sunday to Sunday at a fixed time and place, of their own accord, and who, throughout the service, join with reverence in the prayers addressed to God, and listen with deep attention to the instructions delivered."

It appears from the Memoir of the Calcutta Unitarian Committee, that "The place of meeting is one of the apartments in the range of buildings occupied by Rammohun Roy's Anglo-Hindoo School in that quarter of the city called Simlyah. It is very ill adapted to the purposes of public worship and instruction; but the Committee have reason to believe, that the natives who attend the service, contemplate opening a subscription amongst themselves and their friends, for the purchase of ground, and the erection of a native chapel, to be appropriated to the worship of the One Living and True God."

The Committee state in the Report, that "Among the objects to which the attention of Mr. Adam has been particularly directed, the Anglo-Hindoo school, founded by Rammohun Roy, is a prominent one. The funds for the support of this important establishment, have been principally furnished by this illustrious Brahmin, who, as your Committee believe, is already receiving in the affections of the Indian and Anglo-Indian community, and in the improvement of the native people, the most appropriate reward for his generous exertions. Mr. Adam states, that as this school has begun to excite much public attention, he expects that its sphere of influence will be considerably enlarged. It is now divided into two gradations, in the first of which the English and Bengalee languages, reading, writing, and arithmetic, are taught; and in the second, the English language is made the instrument for communicating higher branches of knowledge, such as geography, astronomy, mechanics, &c. The education offered by this establishment, is completed in six years. A weekly examination takes place, on Mondays, of the progress made by the scholars; and in the astronomical classes, Mr. Adam informs us, that it has been his custom to introduce such religious reflections as grow abundantly out of that sublime science." William Roberts, the native Unitarian Missionary at Madras, is also succeeding in his labours.

"Holland has presented symptoms of religious change; and some publications have appeared, in which Christian Unitarianism is boldly avowed. Your Committee have made a grant of books to the Rev. P. W. Brouwer of Maaslius, whose works on the

'Doctrine of the Scriptures respecting the person of Jesus Christ,' have excited much attention in the Netherlands."

American Unitarian Association.—The Third Anniversary of this Association, was celebrated at the Church in Federal-Street, Boston, on the evening of June 10th. The friends of the cause, in the promotion of which this Society is now engaged, have been greatly cheered and encouraged by the intelligence received from different Sections of the Country, in relation to the progress of liberal principles, and by the zeal and animation with which many of the leading men of our community, have espoused and lent their aid to the support of these principles. The Church where the Association assembled on this occasion, was literally thronged with ladies and gentlemen, many of whom were from distant parts of the Commonwealth. The meeting was opened by prayer offered by Dr. Porter of Roxbury.

After prayer, the Secretary of the Association, the Rev. Ezra S. Gannett, read the Annual Report of the Executive Committee. The purposes for which the Association was formed, are the "diffusion of religious truth, and the increase of true religion." The Report, on this occasion, noticed briefly those circumstances which are thought to be peculiarly interesting through their connection with these purposes. These circumstances were, among others, the publication of tracts; the labours of missionaries; the maintaining an extensive correspondence; the formation of auxiliary societies; the formation of a library; the expressions of sympathy by Unitarians of foreign countries; the formation of a society for the gratuitous distribution of books and tracts; and also of a Sunday School Society, and the establishment of new periodical publications. The Report concluded with an eloquent and affecting allusion to the dispensations of Providence, in the removal by death, of two able and distinguished supporters of the principles of Unitarian Christianity and Christian liberty, the late Robert Little of Washington, and Judge Howe of Northampton.

The meeting was closed by a hymn, sung by the whole assembly standing. The patient and apparently delighted attention given by the large assembly of ladies and gentlemen convened on the occasion, gives encouraging proof of the sympathy that is felt by an intelligent and religious community, in the success and progress of this important Institution.

Unitarianism in Canada.—We rejoice to have it in our power to corroborate the intelligence contained in a letter to our Paisley friends, from Mr. Lambie, inserted in our last Number. From the "Gospel Luminary," of July 10, published at New-York, and conducted by two of the preachers of the denomination called "The Christians," that denomination, as we have before stated, being strictly Unitarian, we learn, that "the Christian Connexion in the Province, is in a prosperous state. There are at present, *Fifteen* churches in Upper Canada, bearing the Christian name exclusively, who acknowledge no master but Christ, and no creed but the Bible." "At the Conference, which was held

in conjunction with the New-York Western Conference, on the 13th June, a Report was given from each church in Upper Canada, bearing the Christian name exclusively, by the messengers who were sent to represent them. It is gratifying to us to be enabled to state, that the Reports were generally favourable, and in some instances, highly gratifying. In the towns of Saltfleet, Dumfries, and other places, revivals are progressing." "Our brethren have erected a convenient meeting-house at New Market, but it was much too small to contain all who attended on the Sabbath," at the meeting of Conference. It gives us much satisfaction to say, that the accounts of the increase of this denomination in other districts of America, are highly encouraging.

British Society for promoting the Religious Principles of the Reformation.—It has for some time been our intention to notice this Society. It is, perhaps, the less necessary now, as we understand the Irish head-quarters of the Institution have been broken up. That a similar fate will attend the naval and military expounders of its intentions and advocates of its schemes on this side of the Channel, we deem more than probable. The first Report of the Society was drawn up more in the form of an indictment against Unitarianism, than explanatory of the objects of the Association, or breathing the spirit of Christian benevolence. We know that that Report opened the eyes of many to its fallacious pretensions to purity and reformation, and that it disgusted intelligent individuals of the orthodox persuasion, who would rejoice that the principles of the Reformation were promoted, and would otherwise have gladly joined in furthering the objects it professed to have in view. One of the passages we allude to, is that in which detailing the obstacles with which the Society has had to combat, the Report particularises the Arian, the Socinian, and the Infidel, as all that is infected, diseased, and degraded, in nominal Protestanism; that these have but one mind, and make war upon the Lamb, but that the Lamb shall overcome them. We happen to know, that in Birmingham, this and other sentences were pointed out to the travelling Leader and Seconder of the Society, and reprobated as they merited; that the excellent and zealous individual, respectable by his talents and character, and by his standing in one of the orthodox dissenting chapels in Birmingham, objected to being on the Committee on these accounts; but that, notwithstanding, his name was proposed in a few hours afterwards at the public meeting, and published, though contrary to his expressed wishes, in the Newspapers. This is a circumstance we know, and it may be an illustration, not unlikely, of the way the schemes of these Reformists are brought to bear in other places.

Immediately after this Birmingham affair, the gallant Captain Gordon and his coadjutors are found at Bristol. Untaught by the lesson of Christian charity they had received, their speeches in that city were full of vituperation against the Unitarians. But their spiritual pride was here destined to meet a fall. Two respectable Catholic priests followed them from Birmingham, and battled the matter for two days with much talent

and ability. The first Resolution approving the establishment of an Auxiliary Society in Bristol, was carried. But when the Resolution for appointing a Committee, was brought forward, Mr. Wintour Harris, moved as an amendment, "That it be an instruction to the said Commitee, to examine the Liturgy of the Church of England as by law established at the Reformation, and in use at the present day, and to report to the next general meeting of this Society, whether there still remains in such Liturgy any relics of Popery, and whether it would be conducive to the principles established at the Reformation, and to the interests of this Society, that such relics of Popery should be expunged from the Liturgy, and to consider of the best means by which such expulsion may be secured." This gave rise to great commotion. By some, it is contended, the amendment was put and carried; others affirm, that neither the original motion nor the amendment were put to the vote; but all agree, that the chairman dissolved the meeting.

We observe, that since the meeting, an intemperate Letter, bearing the signature of "Knox," has appeared in the Bristol papers, reiterating against Unitarians the calumnies which we have noticed, and that it has been admirably answered by "A Christian," in a letter which we would gladly have inserted in our pages, had there been space.

Notwithstanding the tumult occasioned by Mr. W. Harris's proposition, we are disposed to think, that it expresses the truth upon the subject. We shall, in a series of papers, endeavour to substantiate it, taking for the motto of our articles, "As is the Mother, so is her Daughter."

Sermons for Family Use.—For a long time there has been felt amongst us the want of a Volume of Sermons, consisting of discourses, exhibiting and enforcing the connection of religion with the duties and intercourses of domestic life; and which, at the same time, should be so moderate in price as to be accessible, not to the rich merely, but to the middling classes, and to the poor also. Such a volume would be of great value, if well executed, as a manual of piety; in the perusal of which for themselves, and the reading of it to their families, the heads of houses would discharge an important duty, and find a great advantage and pleasure. We are, therefore, happy to have to inform our readers, that a Volume of this description is preparing for the press. Nor, in our opinion, will it derive a small recommendation from the fact, that it will consist of unpublished compositions, by living ministers. Among the contributors, we may name, the Rev. Charles Wellbeloved, York—the Rev. W. Turner, Newcastle—the Rev. J. Kentish, Birmingham—the Rev. J. Tayler, Nottingham—the Rev. J. G. Robberds, and the Rev. J. J. Tayler, Manchester. The Volume is to be published by subscription; and those persons who wish to possess it, are requested to forward their names, without delay, to the Rev. G. Harris, Glasgow; the Rev. R. Aspland, London; or the Rev. J. R. Beard, Editor, Manchester.

Mr. Wm. Parsons Lunt was ordained as Pastor of the *Second* Congregational Unitarian Church in New-York, on Thursday, the 19th June. The service commenced at 4 o'clock, p. m. Introductory prayer and reading the Scriptures, by Mr. Pierpont of Boston. Sermon, by Mr. Greenwood of Boston. Ordaining prayer, by Dr. Kendall of Plymouth. Charge, by Mr. Forthingham of Boston. Right hand of fellowship, and address to the Society, by Mr. Ware of New-York. Concluding prayer, by Mr. Parkman of Boston. Benediction, by Mr. Lunt.

The sermon by Mr. Greenwood, was an able production, clearly exhibiting the power and influence of Christianity in reforming the world, and its happy effects upon private and domestic life. The other performances were appropriate and interesting. Great harmony and unanimity attended all the proceedings of the day.

To Correspondents.

A Correspondent considers the account of the rise and progress of the Unitarian Society in Glasgow, "so far as regards the *origin* of the Society, as very incorrect." He states, that though "great praise is due both to the late Dr. Spencer and his coadjutors, for their zealous exertions in the promotion of Unitarianism, it ought not to be forgotten, that, for many years prior to the appearance of the Rev. James Lyons, as a Missionary from the London Unitarian Fund, there was no Unitarian Society, properly so called, existing in Glasgow. The present Unitarian Society, which was then Universalist, is the only Society in the city which was aided by the exertions of the London Unitarian Fund Missionaries; and this Society was founded by individuals, none of whom knew any thing of the late Dr. Spencer, but by report." "This Society, which has undergone several changes, since its commencement in the year 1807, was carried on for about four years, chiefly by the labours of those who first formed it, during which period it gradually increased. After this, an invitation was given, and accepted by Mr. Yates, to become their Pastor."

G. C. S.—Homo—F. K.—W. J.—"The Unitarian, No. 2."—have been received, and will be inserted. We are obliged to friends at Bristol and New-York, for Newspapers. We shall be glad to have the articles on the Co-operative System. Communications sent direct, are respectfully solicited to be forwarded to the Editor, or Messrs. Hedderwick & Son, Printers, Glasgow, by the 16th of the month. Publications to be reviewed, and other articles for the Pioneer, may be given to the care of

Mr. R. HUNTER, St. Paul's Church-Yard, *London.*
Rev. RUSSELL SCOTT, *Portsmouth.*
Mr. WILLIAM BROWNE, Bookseller, *Bristol.*
Rev. J. R. BEARD, *Salford, Manchester.*

Volumes I. and II. of the Christian Pioneer, may be had of the Booksellers.

THE

CHRISTIAN PIONEER.

No. 27. NOVEMBER, 1828. Vol. III.

Reflections on the Principles and Evidences of Christianity.

LETTER I.

On Christianity as contrasted with the Religion of the Gentiles.

THE difference between the religion and morality inculcated in the collection of books called the New Testament, and the opinions and practices which generally prevailed at the period of the introduction of Christianity, is a subject of the greatest importance; showing its necessity and fitness as a system of reformation, under circumstances in which such a reformation had become indispensably requisite, and also that it imparted knowledge, of which the world must otherwise have been in a great degree destitute, if, indeed, it would not have been totally unattainable. To me, it moreover appears, that one of the strongest standing evidences of the truth of Christianity, arises from comparing it with the state of religion and morals which then prevailed among both the Jews and Gentiles, the two grand divisions of mankind, as it respects the avowed principles of theology.

The ideas and practices of the Gentiles, as it respected the objects of their worship, and the manner in which they endeavoured to propitiate their favour, differed most essentially from those which were inculcated by Christ and his Apostles. They acknowledged a countless multiplicity of deities of different powers and characters, to none of whom did they distinctly ascribe the great work of creation, nor had they any temple or altar dedicated to such a Being. On the contrary, it was the leading object of Christianity, as of all the preceding dispensations recorded in the Jewish Scriptures, to inculcate the doctrine of One all-powerful, all-comprehensive Being, the sole Creator and absolute Disposer of the whole system of nature, and of all derivative existences, to whom alone all religious worship is due; and, consequently, that all the objects of worship among the Gentiles, were, in reality, no gods, but mere inanimate matter, or figments of the

imagination. This is the doctrine which every where pervades, and forms the leading idea through the whole of that numerous and various collection of books called the Bible; and which, though written at periods remote, and under circumstances extremely differing from each other, may yet be said to form one connected view of the proceedings of that great Being, from the beginning to the termination of this habitable world. Gentilism, on the other hand, presents us with no connected system of facts or principles whatever upon this momentous subject; its mythology is traditional, involved in mystic obscurity, and replete with the most grotesque, absurd, and incredible representations.

Although the Gentiles seem to have admitted the existence of invisible powers, yet their worship was uniformly directed toward sensible objects, as the heavenly bodies, animals, and especially the inanimate images of human beings, graven and devised by the art of man, and which they imagined to be inhabited by the spirits of the dead persons whom they represented. The twelve "great gods," which were the supreme objects of worship at Rome, in the time of Christ, were of the last description. The Jewish and Christian Scriptures are every where opposed to this species of worship. They constantly maintain that the universal Creator cannot be represented by any of the objects which he has made; and that the images of heathen worship were nothing more than they appeared to be, mere senseless masses of matter; and, consequently, that all such visible objects of worship are to be discarded, and all adoration uniformly directed to that invisible Being who created and sustains the universe.

The attributes and moral characters which the Gentiles assigned to the objects of their worship, were various; but the former were supposed to be limited, and it would be difficult to select any among their numerous deities, whose characters would endure a rigid examination. Those who were the most distinguished for their power or their antiquity, were stained with the most flagrant vices. "The most ancient of the gods" was represented by a decrepit old man, whose famishing appetite was incessantly craving the blood of his own children, and, accordingly, his worship was celebrated by human sacrifices, or by gladiatorial games, in which the victims of this emblem of cruelty were made to sport away their lives, for

the amusement of the populace of ancient Rome. He to whom the most power was ascribed, who was represented as wielding the thunderbolts of heaven, and as being the "father of gods and men," and even the arbiter of their destinies, was the votary of concupiscence. The worship of one of "the great celestial gods," consisted of unbridled intemperance; that of another, of the most shameless debauchery; one was remarkable for his dexterity in thieving; others were inflamed with the destructive rage, and wild distraction of warfare. In general, their characters and history are so made up of fable and fiction; and the most absurd and criminal actions and propensities ascribed to them, so influenced those of their worshippers, that they sanctioned the practice of the most gross, pernicious, and degrading vices; and ideas of religion and of duty, in the mind of a Gentile, must have been subjected to the most shocking and debasing corruptions—his most solemn religious services, in many instances, consisting of the most extravagant, obscene, and inhuman practices.

When such representations of the powers which sway the destinies, and command the worship and services of mankind, are fairly compared with the One Jehovah of the Scriptures, and especially with the heavenly Father of Christianity, as he is represented in the New Testament, it must be seen that they stand strongly contrasted with each other. As in those writings he is uniformly represented as the sole Creator and absolute Disposer of the universe, so the representations which are given of his attributes, are in accordance with this sublimely rational account of his operations. His power is everywhere represented to be absolute and uncontrolable; his wisdom and knowledge, perfect and all-comprehensive; and though in the execution of his judgments he appears clothed in the matchless terrors of infinite majesty, yet they may be seen to have objects in view, and to lead to results, altogether becoming a God of equity, of mercy, and of beneficence. Being the first and proper cause of all derivative existence, he is properly characterized in the Jewish Scriptures as *Jehovah*, the *essentially existent;* and his attributes are described as strictly invariable, even though all the "works of his hands"—all the effects of his power should be wholly changed, or totally disappear. Under the Christian dispensation, his great leading moral

attribute of benignity shines forth with distinguished glory. It being peculiarly suited to the more matured powers and enlarged capacities of the human mind, he, in a great degree, withdraws the terrors of his power, and in the works and words of his chosen Messenger, manifests the most ineffable good-will and kindness toward a world grossly ignorant of his nature and character, and living in the flagrant violation of his laws.

It cannot, indeed, be denied, that, notwithstanding the general agreement of professing Christians in maintaining the infinite perfections of the object of their worship, the interpretations which have been put upon certain parabolical representations, or other figurative and proverbial expressions, commonly dissevered from their connections, have been by no means compatible with the character of a God of universal and pure benevolence. But to those, who, making due allowances for the bold and glowing imagery of the east, can distinguish between parabolical and figurative expressions and literal truths, and, especially, plain matters of fact, there must appear in the great outline of Christianity—in the circumstances in which it was introduced—in its commands and injunctions, in which the most elevated yet humble devotion is inseparably interwoven and even identified with the most perfect benevolence—in the highly instructive and engaging manner in which all these virtues are realized and exemplified in the life of Christ—in the suitability of the many beneficial miracles ascribed to him, to his character and pretensions—and above all, in the glorious subject of his revelation, as instanced and illustrated by his own resurrection from the insensibility of the grave to a heavenly immortality;—in all this combination of facts, drawn out and portrayed by the artless pens of the Evangelists and Apostles, there must appear the strong characteristics of a benevolence truly divine. HOMO.

(To be Continued.)

Unitarian Worthies.—No. 4, Theophilus Lindsey.

(Concluded from page 61.)

BUT the scene began to brighten. Assistance was afforded; and a room was taken in Essex House, Essex-Street, which was fitted up as a temporary chapel. Dr. Priestley and Dr. Price were indefatigable in their endeavours to

promote the cause in which Mr. L. was embarked, and they kindly offered to indemnify our venerable confessor. When it became generally known that he intended to open a chapel upon principles strictly Unitarian, great offence was taken by many; and means were used, but without effect, to intimidate this magnanimous man, from the execution of his purpose. It was even intimated to him, that the civil powers would interpose to frustrate his design. Though, however, upon the opening of the Chapel, an emissary of Government was known, for some time, to attend the public service regularly, in order to communicate information to persons in power, yet when it was discovered that nothing was either taught or done contrary to the allegiance due to the state, ministers wisely ceased to trouble themselves about Essex-Street Chapel. On Sunday, April 17, 1774, the Chapel was opened, and divine service performed before an audience as numerous as could in reason be expected, and as respectable for rank and character as was ever collected upon a similar occasion. The cause soon began to flourish beyond all expectation. The Chapel was always crowded with attentive hearers, so that many who came late, were obliged to go away for want of room. Considerable numbers of names of great respectability were continually given in as subscribers to the expense of the Chapel, and to the support of the minister. Several pamphlets now issued from the press, animadverting on the views which Mr. L. had adopted, and vindicating the doctrines and rites of the Church. This gave rise to his Sequel to the Apology—the most elaborate of all Mr. L.'s publications. As the congregation increased, and the interest appeared likely to be permanent, it became necessary to provide a suitable place of worship. It was agreed, therefore, to purchase the premises in Essex-Street: this was accomplished; and they were fitted up in their present commodious form for the purpose of a chapel, and for a residence for Mr. Lindsey. From this period, Mr. L. may be considered as fully settled. All difficulties were completely removed. Every thing went on comparatively in a smooth, easy, and equable tenor; and the succeeding years of his life were not more diversified than those of other studious persons and ministers commonly are. Mr. Lindsey was in general blessed with a good share of health, and a natural and equal flow of good spirits. His circumstances, if not affluent, were,

at least, easy and comfortable. His friends were numerous; and he was in the habit of daily, and familiar, and delightful intercourse with persons of the highest respectability, for rank, talent, character, and information. His public services were attended by as large a congregation as the Chapel would admit, all of whom revered and loved their venerable pastor; and listened to his words as though he were an Apostle of Christ. He was engaged in an office to himself the most delightful, and to others the most instructive and edifying; at full liberty to search the Scriptures without any control, and to speak his sentiments without the least reserve, to a people, candid, affectionate, and warmly prepossessed in favour of whatever he addressed to them. If ever any person resigned a situation of ease and affluence, from principles the most pure and disinterested, with expectations the most humble, and with prospects the most gloomy and uninviting, it was Mr. Lindsey. And if any person ever experienced the accomplishment of the evangelical promise, that he who should voluntarily forsake all for Christ and for his Word, should, even in the present life, receive remuneration a hundredfold, Mr. L. was the man. Of this mark of divine goodness, this truly excellent man, who from his cradle had been taught to see the hand of God in every thing, was most deeply sensible.

In the autumn of the year 1778, Mr. L. was seized with a violent fever, which, for some days, excited the greatest alarm among his friends, lest they should lose their revered and beloved instructor. During this trying occasion, the posture of his mind was most pious and becoming. A short period after his recovery it was, that Mr. Belsham, at that time an Orthodox Minister of a congregation in the country, heard Mr. Lindsey. The subject of the sermon was a good conscience, and Mr. B. left the Chapel impressed with the conviction, that it was *possible* for a Socinian to be a good man, though his mind shrunk with horror from the views which Unitarians entertained. In the autumn of 1782, Dr. Disney, then a Rector in Lincolnshire, informed Mr. L. of his intention to resign his situation in the Church, and offering to unite with him in officiating to the congregation in Essex-Street. Nothing could be more agreeable to Mr. L. than this proposal, for he had been long anxious to procure an assistant pastor. The Trustees of the Chapel cordially

concurred with the wishes of their beloved minister, who, with his usual liberality, offered his colleague, who had a growing family, a certain income nearly equal to that which he had resigned.

In the spring of 1783, Mr. L., being now more at liberty, committed to the press, a work, the materials of which he had been collecting some years. This work is entitled, "An historical View of the State of the Unitarian Doctrine and Worship, from the Reformation to our own times; with some account of the obstructions which it has met with at different periods." This is an elaborate work, and one of the most interesting and important of Mr. L.'s publications. In the year 1785, Mr. Lindsey published an Examination of Mr. Robinson's (of Cambridge) Plea for the Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ. The impression made upon the mind of the author of the Plea, was very considerable. Some time after, we find him writing in a letter to a friend:—"there are three divine persons in the Unity of the Godhead! Absolute nonsense—supported by tyranny over men's consciences." It is not quite clear to what distance from the standard of Orthodoxy this ingenuous and inquisitive man carried his speculations upon the subject of the person of Christ. But "for many years," says one of Mr. R.'s family and congregation, in a letter to Dr. Priestley, "but especially for the last two or three of his life, he taught the doctrine of the Unity of the great Cause of all things, expressly and effectually." And in a letter to Dr. Priestley, "I am indebted to you," Mr. Robinson himself says, "for the little I know of rational defensible Christianity. But for your friendly aid, I fear I should have gone from enthusiasm to Deism; but a faith founded on evidence, rests on a rock."

In the year 1786, the dissenting academical institutions at Exeter, Warrington, and Hoxton, having been dissolved, some gentlemen in London formed a plan for erecting a college in the vicinity of London, for the purposes of general education, and to supersede the necessity of sending the sons of dissenting parents to the English Universities, where they were under an obligation of subscribing to Articles which they did not believe. Of this institution, Mr. L. was, from the beginning, a sincere well-wisher, and an active and liberal supporter. In the year 1791, was formed the Unitarian Society for promoting Christian

knowledge, and the practice of virtue by the distribution of books; and this Society he also sanctioned and promoted. Some years before Mr. L. retired from his office at Essex-Street Chapel, his ministry was regularly attended by a nobleman of singular ingenuousness, rectitude, and liberality, the late Duke of Grafton. Early in the year 1793, Mr. L., at that time approaching the term assigned by the Sacred Writer as the limit of human life, resolved to resign his situation as a Christian minister. This he accordingly did, and, on quitting the congregation, he preached a most judicious sermon. The time was now arrived, when the venerable subject of this memoir was destined to experience the severest privation which had ever yet fallen to his lot, by the exile into which the approved friend of his heart, his fellow-labourer and fellow-sufferer in the cause of divine truth, Dr. Priestley, was driven, by the lawless fury of an ignorant mob, and the connivance of the constituted authorities. This memorable event took place in the spring of 1794: over it Lindsey greatly deplored, became with him a correspondent, and published in England, Priestley's celebrated Reply to Paine's Age of Reason.

In the latter end of December 1801, Mr. L. suffered a severe stroke, which at first excited the greatest apprehension. But from this he soon recovered, so as to be able to finish his last interesting work—"Conversations on the Divine Government; showing that every thing is from God, and for good to all." This work exhibits a most interesting view of the aged Patriarch's pious, candid, benevolent, and cheerful mind; of his humble and devotional spirit; and of the happy influence of that rare combination of the principles of a sublime philosophy with the doctrines of pure and unsophisticated Christianity, which, when they become the ruling principles of conduct, elevate the human character to its highest dignity, and ensure the most substantial, exalted, and permanent felicity. Thus gently, thus usefully, did this eminent servant and minister of Christ pursue his way to that quiet abode, which is the house appointed for all living. For after the seizure before mentioned, he gradually declined in bodily strength and vigour. But no symptom of immediate danger appeared till the latter end of October 1808, when he was attacked with a complaint that proved mortal. Mr. L. died in the 86th year of his age. Of his character, no

long recapitulation can be necessary. Disinterested, glowing benevolence, springing from rational, ardent, and deeply-rooted piety; supreme solicitude to discover truth; unwearied pains in searching after it, and inflexible firmness in what, after due inquiry, he believed to be right; just views of revealed religion, combined with earnest but not obstrusive zeal, for their promulgation; and blended with the most unaffected humility, and a singular courteousness of manner; finally and eminently, a commanding sense of God and duty, constituted the principal lineaments in the character of this excellent and truly venerable man.

G. C. S.

Edinburgh Bible Society.

(Concluded from page 55.)

As a farther proof of the efforts made to check inquiry into the Canon and the Inspiration of the Scriptures, I refer your readers to Dr. Thomson's letter to Lord Bexley. In the 74th page, he says: "I may add, as another part of the evil, that while the Committee have been busy in establishing a false Canon of the Scripture abroad, they have, by that means, done much to *unsettle the faith of the people at home.*" "Hitherto, the people at large have had no doubts with regard to the Canon of Scripture. They have had it in their possession. They have derived from it their knowledge of divine things. They have taken it as the standard of their creed, and of their duty. They have appealed to it, when in danger of being seduced by heretical teachers. They have been preserved from the errors of Unitarianism, by their *very horror* at the freedom which the abettors of that system have used with its authenticity, its inspiration, and its integrity! And, in short, the fixed and unqualified understanding, is, that it comprehends the whole revealed will of God, and that it alone [the Confession of Faith of the Church of Scotland, I suppose, excepted] is entitled to determine whatever we are to believe, and do as Christians." "However decided their views may have previously been, there can hardly fail to start into their minds a suspicion that they were wrong—that they have attached too much importance to the doctrine respecting the Canon—that the Bible is not that sacred and inviolable thing, which they have been accustomed to think it." Here we have the great

secret revealed, by which the people are preserved from heresy—the operation of *terror*. And do the people of Scotland derive their faith from this very creditable origin? I trust, this easy confidence in their imputed credulity and prostration of the understanding, will be shaken.

Mr. Haldane, in page 48 of his Exposure of the Rev. Henry Grey's Personal Misrepresentation, &c. says, "I come, in the third place, to the allusion that Mr. Grey has made to the subject of Inspiration. 'Are there not men,' he says, 'as zealous about the purity of the Word of Inspiration in England, as in Scotland?' To this, I reply, that the view generally taken of the inspiration of the Scriptures, is very different in England and in Scotland. In the latter country, *the plenary verbal inspiration of the whole Bible*, is at present maintained by the most distinguished Ministers and Christians of different denominations: in the former, this view of the subject is by many, if not by *all the best informed*, rejected as a '*wild dogma!*'" Elsewhere, he speaks of the dangerous tendency, and the unscriptural nature of the sentiments on the subject of inspiration, which Dr. Doddridge unhappily maintained! Will not such admissions, from such a writer, open the eyes of the people of Scotland, and induce them to think and read for themselves? Mr. Haldane well knows, that the most learned and respectable Ministers in Scotland, are reduced to silence, on these and other important subjects. The thanks are due to the sleepless vigilance of a Presbytery!

The harmless word, Neology, or *New Light*, is most unmercifully used as a scare-crow, to deter the audience at the Assembly-Room, from all impartial inquiry into the Canon and Inspiration of the Scriptures—studies which are evidently connected with the evidences and vital interests of Christianity. Almost all the speakers have learned to pronounce this word and its derivatives. I have been repeatedly asked what it can mean. The Ladies and Gentlemen, I believe, understand that it denotes some dreadful heresy, or enormous wickedness, not fit to be expressed in plain English.

Parallel passages of Scripture are quoted from the authorised and the Improved Version: as for instance, 1 Tim. iii. 16, "And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh, &c." and from the Improved Version, "And without contro-

versy the mystery of godliness is great. He who was manifested in the flesh, &c." The abused and insulted auditors, are expected to know the true reading by intuition—by instinct—by inspiration—or by the confident tone and astounding look of the speaker. Is the Bible Society a place where biblical criticism can be studied? If it were, not a word is said of the reasons assigned by the Editors of the Improved Version, for the preference given to the reading which they have adopted—of the Alexandrian and Ephrem manuscripts—of the mutilation of the Vatican—of the comments of the fathers on the passage as introduced in the Arian Controversy—or of the reading of the text in the second edition of Griesbach.

These declaimers denounce in the most unqualified terms, the addition of a single word to the Bible, or the omission of one, as a crime which subjects the party accused, to the verse in Rev. xxii. 18, 19, to which they incessantly refer, as if it related to the whole Canon of Scripture. It is taken for granted, that all corruptions of the text are wilful. Who would presume to publish an edition of the Bible, or a translation, even with the purest intentions, at the peril of eternal perdition? And who would think that this intrepid Committee, with this sentence hanging over their heads, distributes a version containing the interpolated passage, 1 John v. 7, against the authority of all ancient manuscripts and ancient versions, and against the judgment of many learned Trinitarians—with the words *of God* added in a passage of no little importance, 1 John iii. 16, "Hereby perceive we the love *of God*, because he laid down his life for us"—with several other additions, and not a few false translations—with a perpetual commentary, in the form of tables of contents, at the head of each chapter, which fixes a mystical sense on the Song of Solomon, that has done more towards "turning the Scriptures into ridicule," than all that has ever been written by German Professors and Neologists? After all, what know their audience of the author of the Song which bears the name of Solomon—of the dialect in which it is written—of its date—whether before or after the captivity—or of any superior claims to genuineness and inspiration, which it may, or may not have, if compared with a large portion of the Apocrypha? Must they rely on the printer and bookbinder, or on the equal authority of their infallible Committee?

The separation from the parent Society gives full scope to bigotry in all its concentrated energy and unbounded licence. Speeches ever so dull, tedious, and useless, are received with loud applause, when pointed with invectives against Arians and Unitarians, who are classed with Infidels of every grade, and who are not permitted to vindicate themselves from the most false and groundless charges. Horrific tales are told from oral or manuscript martyrology. One of this kind was rehearsed of a young minister, who had fallen a victim to his constancy in asserting the existence of Satan! Persecution is to be abhorred, be it directed against whom it may, exercised by the many or the few, by the Church or the mob. But this tale is something new. It would have been less wonderful if the martyr had denied the doctrine. Of martyrs who have been stigmatized as heretics, you will believe, not a word was said, and that no reference was made to Servetus or Aikenhead. They only are martyrs who suffer for *the* truth; and truth is defined by the Westminster Confession of Faith! If the story had any foundation, I suppose the preacher was silenced by a *Presbytery*. Had he maintained the converse of the proposition, or had he asserted the unity and the perfect benevolence of God, we should never have heard of him in the Assembly-Room, though he had been expelled from his office, and cast upon the wide world, in helpless poverty, with a wife and children to share his fate.

Unitarians are exhorted not to become subscribers to the Edinburgh Bible Society, under the pretext, that they have published what they consider an Improved Version! Had the speaker a right to assume, that the Improved Version is universally sanctioned or received by the Unitarian body? Are members of the Church of England, or of any other Church, excluded from the Society, because learned individuals of the communion to which they belong, have published versions of several books of the Bible? Are Unitarians to be excluded for their liberality, if they waive their objections to the authorized translation, for the sake of circulating the Bible, in the only form in which the majority will consent to distribute it? No translation can be adopted for distribution in the present day, but by compromise or concession, by men who have the least pretension to biblical criticism, or to common sense. Eusebius, Luther, who rejected the Epistle of

James, and, perhaps, even Calvin, would scarcely have been admissible into this Society. They seem utterly unable to conceive, that Unitarians are not, like themselves, bound to follow implicitly and slavishly, as the rule of their faith, any translation to which, on the whole, they may give a preference.

They profess to be a purely religious Society. But what may be the guarantee of their purity, or the bond of their unity, they have not ventured to tell the world. Their subscribers are not required to sign any Confession of Faith, or to be communicants in any Church. They have a charter free as the wind, for any kind of immorality, if they are not Unitarians. The purity of their Committee is only assumptive, and can be perpetuated only by a secret cabal.

Unitarians are, by an admirable policy, adjured by their honour, not to become members of the Society. They may, if it so please them, sit and hear themselves made the subjects of the grossest misrepresentation, and unfounded calumny. A Unitarian who was present at the last annual meeting, and who had listened, during no small portion of a summer's day, to their intemperate invectives against the sect to which he belonged, gave up his name as the Minister of a respectable Society in the good city, and requested permission to speak. With this request it was not found convenient to comply. The plea of inconvenience, arising from protracted discussion, was not very surprising, considering the unmeasurable length of the speeches inflicted on the president. The motive from which the attempt is made to exclude Unitarians, requires no comment. The fact is, the Edinburgh Bible Society, appears to have been formed for the propagation of Trinitarianism and Calvinism, and for the extension of intolerance in its most unmitigated form. Had it been designed, as it ought, solely to extend the circulation of the Scriptures, Christians of every denomination would gladly have contributed to its funds, and have cordially rejoiced in its stability and success. V.

Sketch of the Controversy between the Rev. J. R. Beard, and the Rev. Robert Taylor.

(Continued from Vol. II. page 365.)

Mr. T.—Pliny could, on his most diligent search, find nothing among the professors of Christianity, but a vile

and excessive superstition: not a precept, not a doctrine, not a circumstance, not an iota of Christianity.

Mr. B.—What, then, is this? "None of these things (*i. e.* invocate the gods, supplicate the image of Trajan, revile Christ), as is said, they who are really Christians, can by any means be compelled to do." If this is not a circumstance, nay, a *principle* of Christianity, of what is it a circumstance?—Of Heathenism?—Of Judaism?—Of what? Gibbon shall answer (vol. II. chap. xi.): "It was the first but arduous *duty of a Christian* to preserve himself pure and undefiled from the practice of idolatry." And what, too, is this? "They affirmed, that the whole of their fault or error lay in this, that they were wont to meet together on a *stated* day, and sing among themselves a hymn to Christ, as to a god."—(L. iii. p. 79.)

Mr. T.—Its professors were so exceedingly abandoned and wicked, that they could not trust each other; and when they met to sing hymns to Christ, as to a god, it was necessary to swear, that there should be no throat-cutting, adultery, nor theft, till the farce was over.

Mr. B.—The passage on which the above representation is founded, is the following:—"They affirmed, that the whole of their fault or error lay in this, that they were wont to meet together on a stated day, to sing hymns to Christ, as to a god, and bind themselves by an oath, not to the commission of any wickedness, but not to be guilty of any theft, or robbery, or adultery, never to falsify their word, nor to deny a pledge committed to them, when called upon to return it. When these things were performed, it was their custom to separate, and then come together again to a meal, which they ate in common without any disorder; but this they had forborne, since the publication of my edict, by which, according to your commands, I prohibited assemblies."—(L. iii. p. 79, 80.)

Mr. T.—There is, then, absolutely no evidence that Christianity originated in Judea, or in the reign of the Emperor Tiberius.

Mr. B.—After such an exhibition of error in your premises, I may safely leave this your inference to fare for itself.—(L. iii. p. 81.)

Mr. T.—The general scope and the greater number of clear and positive texts of the New Testament, treat of Christianity as already established in the world, and of great antiquity when the book was written.

Mr. B.—Of course, the book treats of that as established, whose establishment it records. But something more than vague unsupported assertion might have been expected. However, I make a gratuitous offer of the evidence of the Evangelist Luke, defining the time of the rise of Christianity, with sufficient accuracy for my present purpose. Luke i. 5, "There was, in the days of Herod the king of Judea," &c.—chap. iii. 1, "Now, in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Cæsar, Pontius Pilate being governor of Judea, and Herod being tetrarch of Galilee," &c.—ver. 23, "And Jesus himself began to be about thirty years of age."—(L. iii. p. 81.)

Mr. T.—The Christian Fathers will be found entirely to fail you. They prove that Christianity did not originate in Judea, and disclaiming any thing like novelty and recentness in their religion, challenge for it the honour of a very remote and distinct origination.

Mr. B.—To prove all this, you adduce one quotation from one writer. One quotation from one writer to prove the consentaneous and consistent admissions of the earliest Fathers! And one who was born in the middle of the fourth century! Surely there is some little disparity between your premises and conclusion. Mr. Taylor propagated unbelief; in proof of which, one passage of his writings is adduced; therefore, all the writers in the reign of George the Fourth, propagated unbelief. Augustine says, "The race of Christians is from the beginning." How so? Because, "all that have believed in one God, which the Saviour preached, may be called Christians. For the advent of the Saviour, has been *promised* from the beginning." To establish indisputably, however, that Augustine does not refer the origin of Christianity to remote antiquity, read these words, "There (in Jerusalem) arose the religion of this designation (belief in Christ). He (Christ) died (says Augustine in the same connection), under the consulship of the two Gemini;" that is, A.D. 29. But if you had given the whole passage you have adduced, your hardy assertions would not have had the semblance of truth. These, then, are the words of Augustine: "That every thing which is now called the Christian religion, existed also among the ancients, nor has it been wanting from the beginning of the human race, *until Jesus Christ himself came in the flesh, from which time the true religion, which existed before, began to be called Christian.*"

And let my readers judge of your assertions, from the following facts:—"We are but of yesterday (says Tertullian, A. D. 208), and yet have we filled every place." "Tiberius (adds the same writer), Tiberius (A. D. 14) in whose reign the Christian name was first known in the world." Under the same emperor is its origination placed by Julius Africanus, Lactantius, Severus, Sulpitius, and others.—(L. iii. p. 81–83.)

Mr. T.—Every idea in the New Testament may be dovetailed back to the niches of Pagan idolatry.

Mr. B.—I ask, what has the scriptural idea of the unity of God to do with idolatry or its niches, except to confound and destroy them? And, arguing as though your premises had something to rest upon, if Jesus did nothing more than collect the scattered rays of light, and form them into one grand moral and intellectual luminary, no one, I presume, will deny that he was the maker of that luminary. Whether the ideas found in the New Testament can be dovetailed back to the niches of Pagan idolatry or not, they did not, I suppose, exist there in their present shape, from the foundation of the world. At some time, then, there must have existed a person who liberated them from "durance vile," and embodied them in the glorious temple of truth, which now shines so resplendently on those who choose to contemplate its beauties.—(L. iii. p. 83, 84.)

Mr. T.—Sir William Jones says, "It is an undeniable fact, that the name Chrishna or Christ (which I take to be identical), and the general outline of his story, were long anterior to the birth of our Saviour, and probably to the time of Homer, which we know very certainly." These are the words of the pious Sir William Jones, whom no man will charge with infidelity.

Mr. B.—The argument, therefore, must be good. But here a slip of memory has vitiated your reasoning; for you know, as you inform us, that "the more piety, the more fraud." In the names, Chrishna and Christus, there are four letters similar, and six dissimilar. The roots also of the two words are perfectly distinct. The one is Sanscrit, the other Greek,—the one meaning to anoint, the other denoting "dark blue, approaching to black."* The two roots, then, are totally dissimilar, therefore are

* Sir W. Jones's Works, Vol. I. p. 267.

not identical as far as regards their derivation. Still less is the application of the words the same; if so—if the same, they are differently applied to the two persons in question. But the word Christus, has never been used to designate the Indian god, nor the word Chrishna, to designate the Jewish Messiah. Upon the clearest proof, then, does it appear, that the words Christus and Chrishna, are not identical.—(L. iii. p. 84, 85.)

Mr. T.—But similar actions are ascribed to both, and, therefore, they are one and the same person.

Mr. B.—Similar actions are ascribed to Mr. Carlile and Mr. Taylor, and they are, therefore, clearly the same person.—(L. iii. p. 85.)

Mr. T.—There will be found the stories of his miracles, his preaching, and his actions, even to the minuteness of his washing his disciples' feet.

Mr. B.—Mr. Taylor would here imply, that much more is to be found detailed in Sir W. Jones's works, correspondent with the actions of Christ, than he has stated; nay, so much more, that it descends even to the minuteness of washing his disciples' feet. But Mr. Taylor cannot verify his insinuation.—(L. iii. p. 86.)

Mr. T.—In the Sanscrit dictionary, we have the whole story of the incarnate Deity, born of a virgin, and miraculously escaping, in his infancy, from the reigning tyrant of his country, who "sought the young child's life," and put to death all the children of the place of his nativity, "from two years old and under."

Mr. B.—The words, "sought the young child's life," and "from two years old and under," are not to be found in the pages to which Mr. Taylor has referred. Nor can I there discover the words used by Mr. Taylor, "of the place of his nativity," or "miraculously," or "the *reigning* tyrant of his *country*," or that Chrishna was "born of a virgin." Making, then, the deductions, which the foregoing remarks may justify, from the instances of similarity adduced, or conceived to be adduced, by Mr. Taylor, and we have the following

INSTANCES OF SIMILARITY.

I. A tyrant, at the time of the birth of Chrishna, seeks his life, and orders all new-born males to be slain.

II. Chrishna performs miracles.

III. Chrishna preaches.

IV. Chrishna washes the feet of the Brahmins.

INSTANCES OF DISSIMILARITY.

I. Chrishna was the son of Devaci and Vasudeva.—No such thing read or said of Christ.

II. Chrishna was the predicted destroyer of the tyrant Cunsa.—No such thing read or said of Christ.

III. Chrishna is preserved from this tyrant by biting the breast, instead of sucking the poisoned nipple of a nurse, commissioned to kill him.—No such thing read or said of Christ.

IV. The birth of Chrishna was concealed.—That of Christ was declared at the temple.

V. Chrishna is fostered by a herdsman surnamed Ananda.—No such thing read or said of Christ.

VI. Chrishna, while a boy, slays a terrible serpent, with a number of giants and monsters.—No such thing read or said of Christ.

VII. At a more advanced age, Chrishna puts to death his cruel enemy Cunsa, and foments and conducts a cruel war.—No such thing read or said of Christ.

VIII. Chrishna passes his youth with cow-herd and milk-maid damsels in dancing, sporting, and playing on the flute.—No such thing read or said of Christ.

IX. Chrishna is also called Vandiva, and Govinda, and Vanomali.—No such thing read or said of Christ.

X. Chrishna saves multitudes by arms. No such thing read or said of Christ.

XI. Chrishna is accused by certain nymphs, who complain to Yasodi, that the child Chrishna had been drinking their curds and milk.—No such thing read or said of Christ.

XII. Chrishna has a foster-mother, who reproves him for his indiscretion. On this, he requests her to examine his mouth, in which, to her amazement, she beheld the whole universe in all its plenitude and magnificence.—No such thing read or said of Christ.

XIII. Chrishna exhibited an appearance of excessive libertinism, and had wives and mistresses in number at command.—No such thing read or said of Christ.

And if, to this list, I were to add all the actions ascribed to Christ, to which nothing parallel can be found in the history of Chrishna, which ought to be done, in order to judge of the identity of the persons, the instances of dissimilarity would occupy no small part of this reply. We have seen, then, that the two persons in question have differ-

ent names—were born in different countries—of different parents—are possessed of essentially different characters; and, consequently, they cannot be identical. One or two instances of similarity, indeed, have been adduced; but they are such as may be found to exist between persons confessedly distinct. The sun, therefore, is not more dissimilar, Mr. Taylor, to the moon, than is Chrishna to Christ. So much, Mr. Taylor, for your "proof demonstrative"—so much for your "clearly established alibi."

Nor are my readers to imagine, that Sir W. Jones was a man to be led away by this kind of demonstration. "The adamantine pillars of our faith (he says) cannot be shaken by any investigation of Heathen mythology." The avowed adherence, then, of such a man as Sir W. Jones—of so great a lover of truth—of one who had the best means of judging of the cogency of Mr. Taylor's demonstration—the avowed adherence to Christianity of Sir W. Jones, after the most accurate and minute investigation, is no mean presumption against the correctness of Mr. Taylor's inference, and in favour of my exposure of its supposed justness.

But the decisive statement is yet to come—Chrishna lived long subsequent to Christ. Bentley, in a work which he has lately published on Ancient and Modern Hindoo Astronomy, not only exposes the pretensions of the Hindoos for the great antiquity of their nation, deduced from astronomical calculations (thereby destroying an argument of unbelievers against the credibility of the Old Testament), but also brings down the time of the birth of Chrishna to the *fifth century after Christ.* He states, that it took place "in the year A. D. 600, on the 7th of August, at midnight." This is what Mr. Carlile in vain attempts to find against Christianity, physical disproof—and this, being according to his own likings, may perhaps satisfy him, and Mr. Taylor even, that the name and doctrines of Christ were not borrowed from Hindoo mythology.—(L. iii. p. 86–90.)

Mr. T.—But Jesus could not have been the founder of the Christian religion, because he lived and died a Jew.

Mr. B.—In other words, the Friends cannot establish infant schools, because they are not schoolmasters.—(L. iii. p. 90.)

(To be Continued.)

To the Editor of the Christian Pioneer.

SIR,

I THANK you for sending me your October Number, containing Mr. Yates's Remarks on part of the Preface to the Fourth Edition of my Discourses on the Socinian Controversy. I certainly should be far from willing to do injustice to so highly respectable an antagonist; and it was with sincere reluctance that I felt myself constrained to prefer against him a charge so serious as that of wilful and deliberate misrepresentation. The same feeling which made me reluctant to prefer the charge, should have made me happy, had it been in my power, to retract it. I am aware, indeed, of the deceitfulness of the heart, and therefore would not speak too confidently of myself; for amongst the temptations attendant on controversy, none of the least is the tendency which it engenders to the violation of that charity which "rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth."

In the Preface just referred to, I have explained the reasons by which I was induced to maintain silence, both on the publication of Mr. Yates's "Sequel," and on the appearance of the "Advertisement" prefixed to the Second Edition of that work. I have, at the same time, endeavoured to mitigate the charge in question, as far as the nature of the case would allow me, with a clear conscience, to do. The only additional concession which I am led by Mr. Yates's Letter to make, is one which will make little or no difference on the substantial merits of the cause. I have said, that Mr. Yates presented his "hideous caricature" of the Trinitarian doctrine respecting the union of the divine and human natures in the person of Jesus Christ, *in professing to give a statement* of that doctrine to his readers. Now, I admit that this is, although only to a certain extent, *formally* incorrect; but it is, notwithstanding, *substantially* true.

I certainly never could intend to charge my opponent with wilful misrepresentation, when he gave a statement of the Trinitarian doctrine in *my* words. What I charged him with, was, wilful misrepresentation when he came to give a statement of it in *his own words*. This will be clear to your readers, from the following paragraph of my Reply:—"'Before we begin,' says Mr. Y. 'to examine the evidence for the orthodox opinion concerning the nature of Christ, it is necessary to know what that opinion is.

Nothing could indicate greater irreverence for a question of such vast importance, than to argue and dispute without even understanding what we wish to prove. It is, therefore, matter of no small satisfaction, that Mr. Wardlaw's statements are clear and intelligible.' They are '*clear and intelligible.*' Yet in the next page, Mr. Yates takes care most thoroughly to misunderstand them. I wish from my heart that this were all; but I have a heavier charge to bring against him—the charge of wilful and deliberate misrepresentation—a charge, which he has not left, in this instance, to be made out by inference; but of which he has directly convicted himself. The charge, I admit, is a serious one. Now, then, for the proof of it."

It was quite needless for me to quote again the statement of the doctrine in my own words, as cited by Mr. Yates. My charge rested, of course, on the statement given by himself *in the next page* of his Vindication, to which I accordingly refer. And the sentence in that page to which I had a special reference, is as follows:—"'To maintain, therefore, that the same mind is endued with a divine and human nature, is to maintain that *the same mind* is both *created* and *uncreated*, both *finite* and *infinite*, both *dependent* and *independent*, both *changeable* and *unchangeable*, both *mortal* and *immortal*, both *susceptible of pain* and *incapable of it*, both *able to do all things* and *not able*, both *acquainted with all things* and *not acquainted with them*, both *ignorant of certain subjects* and *possessed of the most intimate knowledge of them.*'"

Now this sentence contains both a *statement* and a *comment.* When Mr. Yates says—"To maintain, therefore, that the same mind is endued both with a divine and human nature"—he most assuredly "*professes to give a statement*" of the Trinitarian doctrine. He, in so many words, represents Trinitarians as maintaining "that the same mind is endued both with a divine and human nature." Now, it was of very little moment that Mr. Yates had quoted *my* statement in my own words, when, in proceeding to his Commentary, he *substitutes another of his own* essentially different from it; one, no doubt, which admitted more readily of being branded with the imputation of contradictory absurdity; but one which no Trinitarian, I presume, ever made or would acknowledge. Mr. Yates knows now, and knew then, that by Trinitarians the human nature which "the Word who was in the beginning

with God, and who was God," assumed into union with the Divine when he "became flesh," consisted, like the human nature in the sons of men, of "*a true body and a reasonable soul;*"—that the *mode* of this union they do not pretend to explain; that they believe the *fact* on the testimony of Scripture, and consider it, in its superiority to their capacity of understanding, as in a similar predicament with the no less mysterious and incomprehensible truth, of the presence of the infinite Jehovah in any limited portion of space. But when, in "*professing to give a statement*" of the Trinitarian doctrine, he couches it in such terms as those I have quoted, he misleads and blinds his readers. Trinitarians simply maintain, that there is in *the person* of Jesus Christ a union of the divine and human natures. Mr. Yates represents them as maintaining that "the *same mind* is endued with a divine and a human nature;"—as if, in the assumption of the human nature, the *divine mind* and the *human mind* had become *one and the same mind*, possessed of the opposite and contradictory properties of the finite and the infinite. I called this "wilful and deliberate misrepresentation;" and I am at a loss to see what else I could have called it. I have, in my last Preface, made the only apology for Mr. Yates that the case seemed to me to admit of—namely, "that the impression on a man's own mind, of the absurdity and contradiction involved in the doctrine of those whom he is opposing, may be so very strong, as to form an almost irresistible temptation to him to incorporate with his statement of that doctrine, what does not properly pertain to it as held and professed by them, but is in reality the inferential deduction of his own mind." If he still declines to avail himself of this apology, I cannot help it. I offered it in sincerity, because I was myself sensible (and who that has engaged in controversy is not?) of the existence and strength of the tendency on which it rests.

To say more than I have now said, would lead me into the merits of the controversy itself, on which I have no intention of entering here. I perfectly concur with Mr. Yates in what he says about the propriety and the duty of self-vindication against every groundless charge, which, either in its own nature, or in the quarter from which it comes, is worthy of notice. And although I did consider him as chargeable with wilful misrepresention, when he put into our mouths a statement of our doctrine in his

own words, such as we ourselves never would have given; yet would I not only qualify the charge, as I have done, by admitting his having been betrayed into the fault by the force of a controversial temptation; I would say, moreover, that I was far from meaning any extension of the charge to a general one against his moral reputation as an honest man. In his Advertisement to the Second Edition of his Sequel, Mr. Yates was determined (if I may use a colloquial expression) to be *quits* with me; for while he is very indignant at the charge I had preferred against him, he prefers one in return against me, and very courteously gives me the lie:—"Let him retract the charge," says he, "which he has kept for six years hanging over me, *and which, nevertheless, I am certain he does not believe!*" He was mistaken, however. I did believe it; and I thought, and still think, I had good ground for believing it. But, conceiving the readers of the controversy to be competent judges of that ground, I smiled at the *retort courteous*, and did not judge it necessary to vindicate my "reputation for veracity," from the aspersion thrown upon it. But surely my opponent has written unworthily of himself, when he says in his communication to you—"But to me a charge of so serious a nature, whether it comes from a man who deserves respect for his integrity, or from one who strives to surround a hollow character with the glare of popularity, is harassing and painful." "*A man who deserves respect for his integrity*," is surely not so *very* high a character, as to render me chargeable with vanity or self-ignorance, in saying, that I should not remain another day in Glasgow, if I thought my fellow-Christians and my fellow-citizens regarded me in any other light. It would be pitiful affectation for me to speak otherwise. Neither my own consciousness, nor the treatment I have experienced for more than a quarter of a century, will allow me. If I enjoy any portion of "popularity," it would be as inconsistent with duty as with natural feeling, that I should wish to forfeit or to lose it. It is a talent entrusted for use, and which it is incumbent on every man, according to the degree in which he possesses it, to turn to proper account. It is my sincere desire to guard against its attendant dangers, and to use it, with humility and self-distrust, in the service and for the glory of my Master. As to *learning*, Sir, I am not conscious of having ever made great pretensions

to it. I pray God to enable me to make a right use of the little I have got. When I read Mr. Yates's words—"Dr. Wardlaw, who, as a scholar, stands at a very humble distance below Horsley,"—I said to myself, and I said it sincerely—"a *very* humble distance indeed!"

I am, Sir,

Yours respectfully,

Ralph Wardlaw.

P. S.—Mr. Yates says in a note (p. 39)—"In the 4th Edition (p. 65), Dr. W. has tacitly altered the statement in question, by substituting "*nature*" in the singular, instead of "*natures*" in the plural number. His language was more correct before the alteration." You will not question my "veracity," when I assure you, that this "*substitution*"—this "*tacit alteration*," was first brought to my knowledge by this note. I had never perceived it. Whether my *Compositor* did, I cannot say. The reader may restore the *s* if he pleases. But the criticism is *hyper—hyper.*

The Unitarian.—No. II.

And how did his Apostles understand Jesus? Did they preach him as the very and eternal God; or did they go on as he did, to preach the doctrine of his simple humanity, and the absolute supremacy of the Father? Let us examine the Acts of the Apostles, as recorded by Luke, and the Epistles of Paul, and we shall then, I think, see how different their belief in Jesus, was from that of so many of their followers. The Apostle Peter's account of Christ, is, "Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you by miracles, and wonders, and signs, which God did by him in the midst of you, as ye yourselves also know." "This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we all are witnesses." "Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ," (Acts ii. 22, 32, and 36). And upon their believing this, he baptized three thousand of them, without their believing in, or even hearing of, those doctrines which are now considered by so many persons to be the very foundation of Christianity: and whoever will, with careful attention, and an impartial

mind, read through the book of the Acts, they will find that the above passage contains the sum and substance of all that the Apostles taught concerning the person of their Lord and Master. But we will turn to the Epistles. "There is none other God but one. For though there be that are called gods, whether in heaven or in earth, (as there be gods many, and lords many,) but to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him," (1 Cor. viii. 4, 5, 6). "For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, (1 Tim. ii. 5). "One Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all," (Ephes. iv. 5, 6). "Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father."—"And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all," (1 Cor. xv. 24 and 28). These passages state, I think, as plainly as language can state, the absolute supremacy of Jehovah, and the inferiority of Christ to him.

In accordance with the precepts and the example of Jesus, we find that the Apostle directs his prayers to the one God and Father of all, and exhorts those to whom he writes to do the same. "To God only wise, be glory through Jesus Christ for ever," (Rom. xvi. 27). "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in Christ," (Ephes. i. 3). "Wherefore I also, after I heard of your faith in the Lord Jesus, and love unto all the saints, cease not to give thanks for you, making mention of you in my prayers; that the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, may give unto you the spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of him," (i. 15 to 17). "For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ," (iii. 14). "Giving thanks always for all things unto God and the Father in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ," v. 20). "And whatsoever ye do in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God and the Father by him," (Colos. iii. 17). "Now, unto the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God, be honour and glory for ever and ever," (1 Tim. i. 17). "Blessed be God, even the Father of

our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of mercies, and the God of all comfort," (2 Cor. i. 3). "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which, according to his abundant mercy, hath begotten us again unto a lively hope, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead," (1 Pet. i. 3). See also Rom. iii. 20; vi. 4; xv. 6. 1 Cor. iii. 21 to 23; ix. 3. Ephes. iii. 14; iv. 6. Galat. iii. 20; iv. 4 to 7. Philip. iv. 6 and 7; ii. 11. Colos. i. 3 and 19. 1 Thess. i. 1. 1 Tim. iv. 9 to 11; vi. 16. Heb. i. 9; xii. 9 and 15. James i. 17 and 27. Jude i. 25; and Rev. iii. 5. &c.

Thus, then, we find that the doctrine of the Unity and absolute Supremacy of Jehovah, was declared by himself to his ancient people the Jews, confirmed in the fullest manner both by the preaching and the example of Jesus Christ, and taught and put in practice by his Apostles. What Christian, then, can deny that it is "the first and the greatest of all the commandments"?

Yet, in contradiction to all this mass of evidence, two opinions have been set up, and have gained almost universal belief, which appear to me to be in direct opposition both to reason and Scripture. The one, that though there is and can be but one God, yet there are three persons—or essences—or somewhats, called the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, in the Godhead or divine essence, which are each of them to be worshipped as God, though together they make but one God! And secondly, in order to reconcile this doctrine with the plain declarations of Christ, that he was in all things inferior to the Father, they who hold it, have formed the strange opinion, that, whilst on earth he was possessed of two natures, the one human—the other divine; that, in the latter, he was equal with his Father; in the former, inferior to him; or in the language of one of their creeds, "equal to the Father as touching his Godhead, and inferior to the Father as touching his manhood."

With respect to the first, I see not how those who believe in and act upon it, can avoid being led to the worship of three Gods; for if each is to be prayed to separately, each must separately be possessed of infinite power, and wisdom, and knowledge; for no being that is not possessed of these attributes can be an object of prayer. With all deference to the many excellent and learned Christians who have believed in this doctrine, to those who may still

believe in it, I will submit a few of the many arguments which might be brought against it, both from reason and Scripture. In the first place, it is contrary to reason: for how can three Gods, each self-existent and eternal, be but one self-existent and eternal God? or how can one God be three? How could any being have been at the same time mortal and immortal, finite and infinite? How could the self-existent and unchangeable God have been born; or have suffered hunger, and thirst, and weariness, or have prayed in anguish for assistance? or how could he who only hath immortality, have died and been buried? or who could live if the Creator of the universe had died?

In the second place, surely a doctrine so contrary to reason, if true, and if so necessary to be believed as its supporters contend, should have been laid down in the clearest manner in every page of the Scriptures. But what is the fact? The passage has never yet been found there, in which three Gods are spoken of, much less said to be one. The passage has never yet been found there, in which three persons are said to be one God, or in which any more than one true God is spoken of. Trinitarians, it is true, *can* find a few passages from which they may infer this doctrine—they can find a few, in which, from the obscurity of the meaning, the inaccuracy of the translation, or in some few instances, from the corruption of the text, there is a semblance of Christ being called God; but they can*not* find one in which Jesus Christ ever spoke of himself as God, or in any respect equal to his God and Father. Let them then read the passages which I have before quoted, (p. 14–16,) and they will see that Jehovah is not only said to be the one true God, but that Jesus Christ expressly distinguishes himself from Him, as him whom he had sent, (John xvii. 3). They will find that the true worshippers are declared to be they who "worship the Father" (iv. 23 and 24); not they who worship Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. They will find that Jesus Christ taught his Disciples, when they prayed, to say, "Our Father"—not, "O holy, blessed, and glorious Trinity." Let them read the words of the Apostle Paul (1 Cor. viii. 4 to 6; 1 Tim. ii. 5; Ephes. iv. 5 and 6, &c. and they will find that he tells us, that to Christians, "there is but one God," which one God is "the Father," and that "there is one mediator between God and men, the *man Christ Jesus*." And if they will read the passages which

I have quoted, (p. 101,) they will find that he prayed to "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ," not to "God the Son, Redeemer of the world," nor yet to "God the Holy Ghost, proceeding from the Father and the Son." These passages, will, I hope, be sufficient to show, that the one God is one person, and that Jesus Christ, though on him was bestowed power and authority in a degree never bestowed on man before, was yet as distinct from the Father and as inferior to him, as to his *nature*, as Moses or any other of the Prophets.*

But then we are told, that when Jesus Christ delivered the words which I have quoted, when he prayed to his Father, or when he did or said any thing which implied inferiority, he spoke, and prayed, and acted, in his human nature only, and that the Apostles spoke of him in the same way. Now it does seem to me very strange, that there should be no mention, in the New Testament, of a doctrine, which, if true, would change its meaning so materially; and, indeed, if the doctrine *be* true, it looks very much like deceit in him who was truth itself, that he should teach his disciples, that Jehovah was the only true God—that he should teach them both by his precepts and example, to pray to the Father only—that he should tell them, that even when he had ascended to heaven, they should ask *him* nothing, (John xvi. 23,)—it does seem strange, that he should tell them he could do nothing of himself, if he knew that he was at the very time he was speaking, the self-existent, omnipotent, and eternal Creator of the universe. And all this without giving them the least hint, that he meant any thing more than the plain and obvious meaning of the words; it does seem to me still more strange, that the Apostle Paul, when writing to those who had long been Christians, and to whom, if to any one, the doctrine should have been made known, should still use the same language, should still direct them to pray, and tell them that he likewise prayed, to the "God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ," by him—and more strange still, *if* this doctrine *be true*, that Jesus Christ

* I have said nothing on the deity and distinct personality of the Holy Ghost, the third person of the Trinity, because it appears to be a doctrine for which few will now contend; and if Jesus Christ were universally acknowledged to be a man, it would soon be forgotten. Should any one, however, wish to examine what the Scriptures say on the subject, he will find all the texts collected in the Christian Reformer, Vol. V. p. 177, or in the first Postcript to Lardner's Letter on the Logos.

himself, in the revelation of his glory given to the Apostle John, should call Jehovah, "my God," which he has done four times in one verse, (Rev. iii. 12). And again, if all that I have quoted, refer to Jesus Christ in his *human* nature only, *where*—I would ask—*where* does he speak of himself, or do his Apostles speak of him, in his *divine* nature? When Trinitarians can answer me this question—when they can show me one passage in the Holy Scriptures, in which Jesus Christ is clearly and unequivocally spoken of as the very and eternal God, equal with the Father—then, and not till then, will I believe that he *had* two natures—then will I believe that he was perfect God and perfect man; that three Gods are one God, and one God three! or any absurdity that the ignorance or the superstition of man ever invented.

I shall endeavour in my next papers, to prove that the few passages which Trinitarians have produced in favour of their doctrine, and in answer to this question, are totally inadequate to prove what I here call on them to prove, and are all either neutral or in opposition to their doctrine.

Γαμμα.

REVIEW.

Memoirs of the Life, Writings, and Opinions, of the Rev. S. Parr, LL.D. by the Rev. W. Field.—Vol. 2.

(Concluded from page 64.)

On the publication of the sermons of the late Dr. Rees, Dr. Parr read them to his parishioners; and in a letter to their author, speaks of them in the highest terms of eulogy. To the Athanasian Creed, Dr. Parr felt a strong repugnance; he was not at liberty to omit it from the service, but he expressed his disapprobation of it to his hearers, and thought himself free to lay more or less stress upon particular parts, according to his own discretion. It was his custom to comment on the lesson or the collect for the day, and by way of a specimen, the substance of what he remarked on the appointed lesson for Christmas day, Isaiah ix. 1–8, is given by Mr. Field. He said, that a great part of this lesson was not correctly translated, and that he had long wished to see it, either more correctly given, or entirely expunged from the church service. He added, that he was obliged to

read it as it then stood, but he would give them another translation, which he thought preferable, subjoining a version consistent with sound reason, as well as biblical authority. Reading, on the same occasion, the proem of John's Gospel, he objected to the term *word*, and recommended as a better rendering, the term wisdom, referring to Prov. viii. 2, 3, which, he doubted not, the Evangelist had in view, when he wrote his introduction. Equally consistent with the sentiments of Unitarians, was the whole of his exposition of this passage. The substance of these remarks is taken from the notes made by Dr. Parr, in the Hatton Prayer-book, in which were also written many other emendations of the common version, and of the church service; but mark! the Prayer-book, since his death, has been removed from the church, and even from the parish. Dr. Parr's ecclesiastical superior was accustomed, as required by his Church, to visit Hatton, and preach for three or four successive Sundays; when Dr. Parr generally contrived to be absent, or if at home, he never attended the services of the Church. On resuming his public duties, he has frequently been known to address his congregation to the following effect:—"My dear parishioners! if, during my absence, any dark, abstruse, unintelligible notions of religion, have been held up to your view, think of them no more—forget them—reject them."

Theology was his favourite study; and his inquiries embraced the whole range of that extensive and important science. To the perusal of the Sacred Volume, he brought all his learning, all his critical skill, and all his most devoted attention. He inquired and judged for himself; and though at an early period of his inquiries, he strongly felt some objections which have been taken to the truth of Christianity, he came to feel that the various, consistent, stupendous evidence in support of Revelation, is such as to bear down all objections, and to require unhesitating credence. But while satisfied and thankful in his own conviction of the truth of Christianity, his candour towards those who honestly dissent, was large and liberal—the prosecution of them he denounced, and of their future acceptance entertained a Christian hope.

Dr. Parr carried his views of ecclesiastical reform to a full and proper extent; and ardently did he wish that Dr. Clarke's reformed Prayer-book was introduced into every Church. With respect to the Supreme Being, Mr. Field

informs us, from personal knowledge, he held the Divine Unity in the strictest sense, conceiving of the three distinctions in the divine nature, as merely three different names of one and the same being, expressive of the three great and important relations, which he bears to his human offspring, as their Creator, Redeemer, and Sanctifier. This system which has been denominated Philosophical Unitarianism, was declared by a public decree of the University of Oxford, towards the end of the 17th century, to be the true doctrine of Christianity and of the Church; whilst the opposite doctrine, now the prevailing Orthodoxy, was condemned! Dr. Parr abjured all the strange and astounding doctrines of original sin, hereditary depravity, arbitrary election, and eternal reprobation. Equally did he reject the common notions of the atonement, as implying expiatory sufferings, and requisite to satisfy the claims of Divine justice. He often declared, that this doctrine was "a libel upon the just and benevolent Deity"—"a gross impeachment of the Divine character"—"placing it in that light in which no good man would wish his own to appear." Future punishment he held to be corrective, intended to produce reformation in the sufferer, and to prepare him, ultimately, for the gradual attainment of happiness. With Bishop Newton, he might have said of the doctrine of never-ending misery:—"Imagine such a doctrine, you may; but seriously believe it, you never can. The thought is too shocking, even to human nature; how much more abhorrent, then, must it be to divine perfection. The Creator must have made all his creatures finally to be happy; and could never form any one whose end he foreknew would be misery everlasting. We can be sure of nothing, if we are not sure of this."

All his opinions, however, he entertained in a spirit of meekness. Religious candour never appeared upon earth in a purer spirit, or under a more engaging form. There was not only the absence, but the utter abhorrence of bigotry; there was not only the presence, but the glowing warmth, the stirring and active life of Christian charity. The sincere and virtuous of all religions, he held, are equally the objects of the divine favour, and have an equal right to challenge approbation from men. As a member of the State, he was emphatically an English Patriot; by ancient learning, he was warmed into the love of ancient freedom; as a village Pastor, he discharged his duties with exemplary

zeal and fidelity: in him the poor found a friend, and the young a guide and instructor. Well is it for humanity that such men occasionally appear, that our common and much defamed nature may be vindicated; and well is it for the interests of truth, that the qualities of Dr. Parr's mind and heart—which are the qualities that every competent judge would prescribe, as likely to lead to the discovery of the will of God—led him to the adoption of Unitarianism. And no little comfort and support does it give the mind—assailed as we are on every side—to hear the testimony of the great and good, thus successively setting their seal to what we deem primitive Christianity.*

G. C. S.

"The Burial and Resurrection of Jesus Christ, according to the four Evangelists."—From the German of John David Michaelis.

THE name of Michaelis is held in high repute among theological students. His erudition was profound and extensive, and his productions are exceedingly voluminous. In this country, he is chiefly known by his Introduction to the New Testament, translated by Bishop Marsh—a work, when accompanied by the comments of his English Translator, which are necessary to modify, restrict, and explain, many of the author's statements, of inestimable value to the Theological Student, both on account of the information which it conveys, and the rational and enlightened spirit in which it is composed. The little work on the burial and resurrection of Christ, now before us, will be found to sustain the reputation of the author; an assertion which is no mean praise, considering how high

* We have inserted with pleasure our Correspondent's Review of Dr. Parr's Life. In his concluding remarks, however, we do not coincide. We think nearly the whole weight of Dr. Parr's testimony to Unitarianism, was destroyed by his practical non-adherence to it. If we admire and venerate Theophilus Lindsey, we cannot equally admire and venerate one who continued to receive the emoluments of a Church whose doctrines he disbelieved. A poor, unlearned, but morally honest man, giving up his prejudices, and openly professing and practising what he believes to be Christian truth, we hold in much greater respect, than any individual, however talented or learned, who from any cause whatever was ashamed of the obloquy attendant on virtuous consistency. It is not by such conduct as that of Dr. Parr, that Christian truth is to be promoted; and to hold his character up to the admiration of Unitarians, is, in fact, to praise the conduct of those who "cannot afford to keep a conscience."—*Edit.*

that reputation stands. In the Introduction, occur the following remarks on the inspiration of the Gospels:

"I have already shown, in my introduction to the New Testament, that the truth of Christianity does not depend upon the fact of the divine inspiration of its penmen, and that he who wishes to convince another of its truth, must begin by considering the four Evangelists as human beings, who wrote with all the conviction and sincerity of belief, but with all the fallibility of men. The adoption of this principle, as applying equally to sacred and profane historians, would eventually and entirely remove all doubts. If four men write a history of what has taken place in their own time, and do not all rectify their narrations by one and the same standard, it is almost impossible they should perfectly agree, and that they should not be liable to variations. In the instance of the resurrection, John, who was present, is the chief and the most important witness; Matthew and Mark are the next in value, and Luke entirely depends upon what he has heard. Supposing, therefore, a discrepancy to exist, this only proves that two men have erred in what is by no means a fundamental point, not that the history is fundamentally false. Were not this the fact, we should have no history at all, for contemporary historians are always at variance. Take the Roman history, which presents, through different authors, such different statements, that the scholar is at a loss which to credit, although he never doubted the existence of a Punic war. Cæsar, the victor in the battle of Pharsalia, and Florus, a subsequent writer, make a difference in the number of combatants, to the amount of 150,000 men. Cæsar says nothing of his German soldiers, although through them he is said to have won the battle; and other historians speak of this circumstance as a recognised fact. No two authors ever agree in the amount of troops who formed the expedition of Xerxes; but the ground-work remains undisputed. Josephus, both in his Jewish history as well as his subsequent antiquities of the Jews, contradicts himself; but no one doubts the general excellence of Josephus as a historian. If, therefore, the account of the resurrection should present some apparent discrepancies, are we therefore to conclude the whole account to be a fable? Such a conclusion is against all analogy, and against all reason. If the combined history was so written as to present no apparent discrepancy, would the testimony of the four Evangelists be sufficient to convince one of the fact? I should say, 'No.' Laying out of all question the doctrine of inspiration, I should fancy, then, that these four writers had previously agreed what to write, and their entire concord—so remarkable a deviation from other historians—would make me suspicious. But we do not believe the resurrection of Jesus upon the testimony and the details of the four Evangelists merely; we believe it, because it was believed and known to be certain and true above 1800 years ago, and before the Evangelists and the Apostles had written—we believe it upon the testimony of disciples, who say they were themselves eye-witnesses of the fact—who saw Jesus after his resurrection—who avowed it before

the Synod at Jerusalem, although they knew that pain, and anguish, and misery, would follow it: some of whom sealed their belief in the fact with their blood, without any one of them recalling that belief, or disavowing their knowledge. The High Priests stated, that the body had been stolen; but to have ascertained such a theft, would have completely crushed the new religion. And easy was it to make the discovery; a man whose face was known throughout Palestine, and whose dead body exhibited marks of crucifixion—whose side had been pierced by a spear—and whose legs remained unbroken, was not an object that could be easily mistaken; in fact, no other dead body could have been produced for it. If the High Priests had any confidence in their own case, they would, as a matter of course, have instituted investigation; but this they never did, although they admit the body to have been in the grave, and confine themselves to the assertion, that the disciples stole it. Herod Agrippa, who certainly was no mean enemy of Christianity, and a warm friend of the Jews, never ordered inquiry to be made; and the torture was then a common mode of examination, and would have been used with very little ceremony; but we find no attempt at investigation. Indeed, the proofs of Christianity were, at its origin, so strong, that it fairly gained the cause by its intrinsic strength, and persecution had not the power to arrest its progress." "Luther himself," we are informed, "doubted whether inspiration was confined to doctrine, or extended to historical facts."

The writer having made some judicious observations, tending to show that John wrote his Gospel to supply the defects of the other historians, proceeds to establish several points, for example, that "Jesus *is actually found dead upon the cross, and pierced.*" With this view, there follows a citation from John xix. 31–37. By this, one objection to the resurrection of Christ is removed, that he might not have been really dead, but only in a fit. In a similar manner, he proceeds through the whole scene of the resurrection, burial, and ascension, of Jesus, carefully exhibiting and solving difficulties, and presenting the history in a luminous and unexceptionable aspect. We cannot follow the author step by step, but shall proceed to select a few passages, which, in themselves, may offer useful and interesting matter to our readers. "Matt. xxvii. 64, *Lest his disciples come by night and steal him away.* Such a deceit, had, in fact, about 17 years before, been played off by a servant of the name of Clemens, who stole the ashes and the bones of his murdered master Agrippa—spread a false report that Agrippa had fortunately escaped, and was still alive—gave himself out to be Agrippa—and aspired, under this name, to mount the imperial throne. As an imposture of this kind had nearly

shaken the Roman empire, and involved it in civil war, the care and entreaty of the Jews was very reasonable, and Pilate could not well refuse it without exposing himself to serious responsibility." "Matt. xxviii. 2, *And behold, there was a great earthquake.* Thus it has been translated in the English and in Luther's translation. But there may be an error. An earthquake is very extensive; and it would be an extraordinary statement, if we were to say, 'there was a great earthquake; for an angel rolled back the stone from the sepulchre.' But if we translate it, 'a convulsive motion of the earth,' we should not give it the extensive and popular notion of an earthquake. I would thus state it:—'The ground about the grave was completely shaken, and something fell which was like lightning, and had the effect of driving the stone away from the door, to such a distance as to create this violent concussion.'"

The verses of the 16th chapter of Mark, from 9th to 15th verses, present difficulties which it is not easy to harmonize with the accounts of the other Evangelists. But our author shows that their authenticity is very doubtful. "These verses," he informs us, "did not exist in the time of Jerome, 1400 years ago, in all the MSS. of the Latin translation, and, in general, in few Greek MSS."

John xx. 28, *And Thomas answered and said unto him, my Lord and my God.* "I will not go so far as to conclude from these words, that Thomas actually recognised at the time, the divine nature of Christ, of which we have no trace amongst the Apostles, previous to the effusion of the Holy Ghost; at least it was not the common doctrine of the Jewish Theology. But he rather names him in a figurative sense, as one risen from the dead. 'His God,' whom he will always honour and adore, in the same way as Virgil in his first Eclogue, only still stronger, addresses Augustus: 'For he shall always be my god, the tender lamb from our folds shall often stain his altars.'"

John xxi. 25, *I suppose, that even the world itself could not contain the books which should be written.* "An hyperbole much in the same way as Virgil: 'If I had an hundred tongues, and an hundred mouths, and an iron voice, capable of comprehending every species of crime, I could not describe the names of all the punishments,' with this difference, that this hyperbole, carried to a greater extreme, is common amongst the Jews in

their colloquial writings. Wetstein has shown several instances of it. Thus, 'If all the seas were ink, all the plants writing reeds, and every man a writer, I should be unable to write down.'"

Mat. xxviii. 19, *In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.* "We know how frequently this passage is quoted as a proof of the doctrine of the Trinity, by many, indeed, who do not believe this doctrine, and wish, perhaps, to condemn it. I must confess I cannot see it in this view. The eternal divinity of the Son, is here not even mentioned, and it is impossible to understand from this passage, whether the Holy Ghost is a person. The meaning of Jesus may have been this, 'Those who were baptized, should, upon their baptism, confess that they believed in the Father, and in the Son, and in all the doctrines inculcated by the Holy Spirit.' In fact, I do not believe that the words in the form of baptism can signify more, because it was impossible for the majority of those who believed, to think more upon the subject at the time, for they were not regularly instructed in the mystery of the Trinity before baptism, and only received complete instruction in the doctrines of Christianity after baptism. Read only the second chapter of the Acts, where three thousand persons were baptized in one day. What did these persons know of the divinity of Christ, of which Peter, in his discourse, did not say a word? What did they know of the personality of the Holy Ghost? These were not doctrines of the Jewish Church. The oldest illustration of these words (that of Justin Martyr), coincides with what has been above stated."

Ver. 21, *I am with you always*, &c. "This is certainly not meant in a bodily sense, but implies the love, providence, assistance, and protection of Christ, upon which believers may rely as long as the world exists. I will here quote the language of a very rational and learned man, a Syrian (and Christ spoke Syriac) the great philosopher, physician, and historian, Gregory Bar Hebrieus, Primate of the Syrian Church, who was incontestably the most learned man of his day, in the 13th century. He said upon his death-bed to his scholars, 'If ye continue in love, I will be amongst you.' This sensible man did not contemplate any bodily presence, he merely had in view a sentiment of good and common feeling, and the natural harmony of virtuous minds." G. C. S.

THE

CHRISTIAN PIONEER.

No. 28. DECEMBER, 1828. Vol. III.

Trinitarianism Self-condemned.

DR. WHATELY, the learned Principal of St. Alban's Hall, Oxford, and author, amongst other useful works, of an excellent Treatise on Logic, has, in the last mentioned work, some observations under the head *Person*, relatively to the effects of Trinitarianism as commonly taught, which, coming from one who is an avowed Trinitarian, contain admissions that are not a little remarkable.

The learned writer animadverts, at some length, on the ordinary and on the theological meaning of the term *person*. In the common acceptation, person signifies a numerically distinct substance: each man is one person, and can be but one. Very different, however, is the meaning of the word as used in the language from which it has come to us. In Latin, it primarily signified a mask which actors wore on the stage; but as each mask was painted, in each instance, suitably to the character to be supported, the word *personæ*, came to mean the character itself which the actor played, and afterwards, any character, proper or assumed, which any one sustained. Thus, Cicero, in describing the process by which he composed his pleadings, *viz.* by imagining himself in the place of his opponent and of the judge, as well as his own, says, *Tres personas unus suscipio:*—though one being, I assume these three characters (persons.) In this classical sense, Dr. Whately contends it was understood by our creed-makers; and in such a sense it ought, he continues, to be understood by all theologians; and by the aid of this explanation, the Trinity should be taught to the people. The Trinitarianism of Dr. W. is, therefore, what has been aptly termed "Unitarianism in a mist;" and the three persons are no more three distinct intelligent minds, than was the ancient orator Cicero.

To the neglect of this classical meaning of the word *person*, Dr. W. moreover, ascribes serious evils: it leads, he assures us, to Tritheism. A hundred times have Unitarians contended that such was the natural and necessary

tendency of the commonly taught notions of the Trinity; and, for ourselves, we doubt not that the majority of avowed Trinitarians, are either Unitarians without knowing it, or sheer Tritheists. But let us hear Dr. Whately; "Many who do understand, or, at least, have once understood, the ambiguity in question [*i.e.* arising from the two significations we have mentioned], are apt to sit down satisfied that they are safe from all danger in that quarter [*i. e.* Tritheism], not considering how much the thoughts are habitually influenced, through the force of association, by the recurrence of the ordinary sense of the word [*i. e.* person]. And hence the frequent use, in other subjects, of the word person, in its ordinary sense, causes them to slide insensibly into the unthought-of, but I fear *too common heresy of Tritheism;* from which they think themselves the more secure, because they always maintain the Unity of the Deity; though they gradually come to understand *that* Unity in a merely *figurative* sense; *viz.* as a unity of purpose—concert of action, just as one commonly says, 'My friend such-a-one and myself are one;' meaning that they pursue the same design." Such is the tendency of Trinitarianism, allowed by one who calls himself a Trinitarian; and if this process takes place, and goes forward so easily and rapidly in the case of those who "understand," how much more certainly, easily, rapidly, and extensively, must it take place in the minds of the ignorant and unwary!

The Doctor proceeds, "This error of Tritheism, thus introduced, is indeed one which can hardly be neglected as in itself trifling, if we reflect, that the maintenance of the doctrine of the strict Unity of God, was no small part of the great purpose for which one nation was, during so many ages, kept apart from the rest of the world." He adds, "Many are driven by this means into a perversion of the Gospel truth [*i. e.* we imagine, to Unitarianism], or *a total rejection of it*—[what Unitarians have iterated again and again; yes, here is the great cause of unbelief, the absurdity of prevailing dogmas]—but also a far greater number of well-intentioned Christians, are led to the practical *neglect* of a doctrine which is the corner-stone of our faith. They find their minds so perplexed and confused by the ordinary statements of the doctrine of the Trinity, and in such danger of sliding into Tritheism, that while they humbly yield their assent, they, at the same time" (I

say this, the Doctor remarks, in a great measure, not from conjecture, but from knowledge of the fact) "deliberately, and as a point of conscience, study to keep the doctrine out of their thoughts." So that, after all, poor abused Unitarianism, it seems, is the operating principle with these well-intentioned Christians. Where, then, is the utility of Trinitarianism? Utility!—the worthy Principal himself shows it has none. Its only *use*, according to him, is to perplex and confound, and to alienate men from the faith of the Gospel. Surely, that the Christian world were well and speedily rid of a doctrine—bordering so closely on a serious heresy—having a natural tendency to lapse into heresy—and which, as held by the majority, is a heresy—a doctrine either discarded by the good, or confounding and perplexing, and making unbelievers—is a consummation devoutly to be wished. G. C. S.

Additional Remarks on the Character of Napoleon Bonaparte, by Dr. Channing of Boston, North America.

(Concluded from page 22.)

We have spoken of the supreme importance which is attached to rulers and government, as a prejudice; and we think that something may be done towards abating the passion for power, by placing this thought in a clearer light. It seems to us not very difficult to show, that to govern men is not so high a sphere of action as has been commonly supposed, and that those who have obtained this dignity, have usurped a place beyond their due, in history and men's minds. We apprehend, indeed, that we are not alone in this opinion; that a change of sentiment on this subject has commenced and must go on; that men are learning that there are higher sources of happiness, and more important agents in human affairs, than political rule. It is one mark of the progress of society, that it brings down the public man, and raises the private one. It throws power into the hands of untitled individuals, and spreads it through all orders of the community. It multiplies and distributes freely means of extensive influence, and opens new channels, by which the gifted mind, in whatever rank or condition, may communicate itself far and wide. Through the diffusion of education and printing, a private man may now speak to multitudes, incomparably more numerous, than ancient or modern eloquence ever electrified in the popular assembly or the hall of legislation. By these instruments, truth is asserting her sovereignty over nations, without the help of rank, office, or sword; and her faithful ministers will become more and more the lawgivers of the world.

We mean not to deny, we steadily affirm, that government is a great good, and essential to human happiness; but it does its good chiefly by a negative influence, by repressing injustice and crime, by securing property from invasion, and thus removing obstructions to the free exercise of human powers. It confers little positive benefit. Its office is not to confer happiness, but to give men opportunity to work out happiness for themselves. Government resembles the wall which surrounds our lands; a needful protection, but rearing no harvest, ripening no fruits. It is the individual who must choose whether the enclosure shall be a paradise or a waste. How little positive good can government confer? It does not till our fields, build our houses, weave the ties which bind us to our families, give disinterestedness to the heart, or energy to the intellect and will. All our great interests are left to ourselves; and governments, when they have interfered with them, have obstructed, much more than advanced them. For example, they have taken religion into their keeping, only to disfigure it. So, education, in their hands, has generally become a propagator of servile maxims, and an upholder of antiquated errors. In like manner, they have paralysed trade by their nursing care, and multiplied poverty by expedients for its relief. Government has almost always been a barrier against which intellect has had to struggle; and society has made its chief progress by the minds of private individuals, who have outstripped their rulers, and gradually shamed them into truth and wisdom.

Virtue and intelligence are the great interests of a community, including all others, and worth all others; and the noblest agency is that by which they are advanced. Now, we apprehend that political power is not the most effectual instrument for their promotion, and accordingly we doubt whether government is the only or highest sphere for superior minds. Virtue, from its very nature, cannot be a product of what may be called the direct operation of government, that is, of legislation. Laws may repress crime. Their office is to erect prisons for violence and fraud. But moral and religious worth, dignity of character, loftiness of sentiment, all that makes man a blessing to himself and society, lies beyond their province. Virtue is of the soul, where laws cannot penetrate. Excellence is something too refined, spiritual, celestial, to be produced by the coarse machinery of government. Human legislation addresses itself to self-love, and works by outward force. Its chief instrument is punishment. It cannot touch the springs of virtuous feelings, of great and good deeds. Accordingly, rulers, with all their imagined omnipotence, do not dream of enjoining by statute, philanthropy, gratitude, devout sentiment, magnanimity, and purity of thought. Virtue is too high a concern for government. It is an inspiration of God, not a creature of law; and the agents whom God chiefly honours in its promotion, are those who, through experience as well as meditation, have risen to generous conceptions of it, and who show it forth, not in empty eulogies, but in the language of deep conviction, and in lives of purity.

Government, then, does little to advance the chief interest of

human nature by its direct agency; and what shall we say of its indirect? Here we wish not to offend; but we must be allowed to use that plainness of speech which becomes Christians and freemen. We do fear, then, that the indirect influence of government, is, on the whole, adverse to virtue; and in saying this, we do not speak of other countries, or of different political institutions from our own. We do not mean to say, what all around us would echo, that monarchy corrupts a state, that the air of a court reeks with infection, and taints the higher classes with a licentiousness which descends to their inferiors. We speak of government at home; and we ask wise men to say whether it ministers most to vice or virtue. We fear, that here, as elsewhere, political power is of corrupting tendency; and that, generally speaking, public men are not the most effectual teachers of truth, disinterestedness, and incorruptible integrity to the people. An error prevails in relation to political concerns, which necessarily makes civil institutions demoralizing. It is deeply rooted, the growth of ages. We refer to the belief, that public men are absolved in a measure from the everlasting and immutable obligations of morality; that political power is a prize, which justifies arts and compliances that would be scorned in private life; that management, intrigue, hollow pretensions, and appeals to base passions, deserve slight rebuke when employed to compass political ends. Accordingly, the laws of truth, justice, and philanthropy, have seldom been applied to public as to private concerns. Even those individuals, who have come to frown indignantly on the machinations, the office-seeking, and the sacrifices to popularity, which disgrace our internal condition, are disposed to acquiesce in a crooked or ungenerous policy towards foreign nations, by which great advantages may accrue to their own country. Now, the great truth on which the cause of virtue rests, is, that rectitude is an eternal, unalterable, and universal law, binding at once heaven and earth, the perfection of God's character, and the harmony and happiness of the rational creation; and in proportion as political institutions unsettle this great conviction—in proportion as they teach that truth, justice, and philanthropy, are local, partial obligations, claiming homage from the weak, but shrinking before the powerful—in proportion as they thus insult the awful and inviolable majesty of the Eternal Law—in the same proportion they undermine the very foundation of a people's virtue.

In regard to the other great interest of the community, its intelligence, government may do much good by a direct influence; that is, by instituting schools, or appropriating revenue for the instruction of the poorer classes. Whether it would do wisely in assuming to itself, or in taking from individuals, the provision and care of higher literary institutions, is a question not easily determined. But no one will doubt, that it is a noble function, to assist and develope the intellect in those classes of the community, whose hard condition exposes them to a merely animal existence. Still the agency of government in regard to knowledge, is necessarily superficial and narrow. The great sources of intellectual power and progress to a people, are its strong and ori-

ginal thinkers, be they found where they may. Government cannot, and does not, extend the bounds of knowledge; cannot make experiments in the laboratory, explore the laws of animal or vegetable nature, or establish the principles of criticism, morals, and religion. The energy which is to carry forward the intellect of a people, belongs chiefly to private individuals, who devote themselves to lonely thought, who worship truth, who originate the views demanded by their age, who help us to throw off the yoke of established prejudices, who improve old modes of education, or invent better. It is true, that great men at the head of affairs, may, and often do, contribute much to the growth of a nation's mind. But it too often happens that their station obstructs rather than aids their usefulness. Their connexion with a party, and the habit of viewing subjects in reference to personal aggrandisement, too often obscure the noblest intellects, and convert into patrons of narrow views and temporary interests, those, who, in other conditions, would have been the lights of their age, and the propagators of everlasting truth. From these views of the limited influence of government on the most precious interests of society, we learn that political power is not the noblest power, and that, in the progress of intelligence, it will cease to be coveted as the chief and most honourable distinction on earth.

If we pass now to the consideration of that interest, over which government is expected chiefly to watch, and on which it is most competent to act with power, we shall not arrive at a result very different from what we have just expressed. We refer to property or wealth. That the influence of political institutions on this great concern is important, inestimable, we mean not to deny. But as we have already suggested, it is chiefly negative. Government enriches a people, by removing obstructions to their powers, by defending them from wrong, and thus giving them opportunity to enrich themselves. Government is not the spring of the wealth of nations, but their own sagacity, industry, enterprise, and force of character. To leave a people to themselves, is generally the best service their rulers can render. Time was, when sovereigns fixed prices and wages, regulated industry and expense, and imagined that a nation would starve and perish, if it were not guided and guarded like an infant. But we have learned, that men are their own best guardians, that property is safest under its owner's care, and that, generally speaking, even great enterprises can better be accomplished by the voluntary association of individuals, than by the state. Indeed, we are met at every stage of this discussion by the truth, that political power is a weak engine compared with *individual* intelligence, virtue, and effort; and we are the more anxious to enforce this truth, because, through an extravagant estimate of government, men are apt to expect from it what they must do for themselves, and to throw upon it the blame which belongs to their own feebleness and improvidence. The great hope of society, is individual character. Civilization and political institutions are themselves sources of not a few evils, which nothing but the intellectual and moral energy of the private citizen can avert or relieve. Such, for example, are the

monstrous inequalities of property, the sad contrasts of condition, which disfigure a large city; which laws create, and cannot remove; which can only be mitigated and diminished by a principle of moral restraint in the poorer classes, and by a wise beneficence in the rich. The great lesson for men to learn, is, that their happiness is in their own hands; that it is to be wrought out by their own faithfulness to God and conscience; that no outward institutions can supply the place of inward principle, of moral energy, whilst this can go far to supply the place of almost every outward aid.

Our remarks will show, that our estimate of political institutions, is more moderate than the prevalent one, and that we regard the power, for which ambition has woven so many plots and shed so much blood, as destined to occupy a more and more narrow space, among the means of usefulness and distinction. There is, however, one branch of government, which we hold in high veneration, which we account an unspeakable blessing, and which, for the world, we would not say a word to disparage; and we are the more disposed to speak of it, because its relative importance seems to us little understood. We refer to the Judiciary, a department worth all others in the state. Whilst politicians expend their zeal on transient interests, which perhaps derive their chief importance from their connection with a party, it is the province of the Judge to apply those solemn and universal laws of rectitude, on which the security, industry, and prosperity of the individual and the state essentially depend. From his tribunal, as from a sacred oracle, go forth the responses of justice. To us there is nothing in the whole fabric of civil institutions so interesting and imposing, as this authoritative exposition of the everlasting principles of moral legislation. The administration of justice in this country, where the Judge, without a guard, without a soldier, without pomp, decides upon the dearest interests of the citizen, trusting chiefly to the moral sentiment of the community for the execution of his decrees, is the most beautiful and encouraging aspect, under which our government can be viewed. We repeat it, there is nothing in public affairs so venerable as the voice of Justice, speaking through her delegated ministers, reaching and subduing the high as well as the low, setting a defence around the splendid mansion of wealth and the lowly hut of poverty, repressing wrong, vindicating innocence, humbling the oppressor, and publishing the rights of human nature to every human being. We confess, that we often turn with pain and humiliation from the hall of Congress, where we see the legislator forgetting the majesty of his function, forgetting his relation to a vast and growing community, and sacrificing to his party or to himself, the public weal; and it comforts us to turn to the court of justice, where the dispenser of the laws, shutting his ear against all solicitations of friendship or interest, dissolving for a time every private tie, forgetting public opinion, and withstanding public feeling, asks only what is RIGHT. To our courts, the resorts and refuge of weakness and innocence, we look with hope and joy. We boast, with a virtuous pride, that no breath of corruption has

as yet tainted their pure air. To this department of government, we cannot ascribe too much importance. Over this, we cannot watch too jealously. Every encroachment on its independence, we should resent and repel, as the chief wrong our country can sustain. Wo, wo to the impious hand, which would shake this most sacred and precious column of the social edifice!

In the remarks which we have now submitted to our readers, we have treated of great topics, if not worthily, yet, we trust, with a pure purpose. We have aimed to expose the passion for dominion, the desire of ruling mankind. We have laboured to show the superiority of moral power and influence, to that sway which has for ages been seized with eager and bloody hands. We have laboured to hold up to unmeasured reprobation, him who would establish an empire of brute force over rational beings. We have laboured to hold forth, as the enemy of his race, the man who, in any way, would fetter the human mind, and subject other wills to his own. In a word, we have desired to awaken others and ourselves, to a just self-reverence, to the free use and expansion of our highest powers, and especially to that moral force, that energy of holy, virtuous purpose, without which we are slaves amidst the freest institutions. Better gifts than these, we cannot supplicate from God; nor can we consecrate our lives to nobler acquisitions.

Reflections on the Principles and Evidences of Christianity.

LETTER II.

On the Scriptural Representations of Death and the Resurrection.

THE darkest shade which has been thrown over Christianity, has long appeared to me to be that which has arisen from too intimately assimilating and blending its great doctrine of immortal life, with the ideas of the Gentiles respecting futurity. In several respects they form a strong contrast with each other; though by many they seem to have been regarded as nearly identical, or, at least, that Christianity differs from Gentilism upon this head, only by teaching the doctrine of the resurrection of the body, and its re-union with the soul; and this doctrine has appeared to some, by whom it has been entertained, rather as a mystery, difficult to be reconciled with our ideas of a future, glorious, and blissful state of existence; and especially with the spirituality of its nature, than in the light of a gracious revelation. There is reason to believe, that the promulgators of Christianity, conveyed a very different idea of its distinguishing doctrine, to those by

whom it was first embraced, and that they were taught to combine with it, at once, the most rational, the most elevated, and the most cheering ideas, to which those of the Gentiles were strongly opposed.

The natural idea of vitality, as opposed to its loss or privation, is that of something exceedingly elevating and cheering; it is the source of all percipience, knowledge, and enjoyment; while its contrary, is the state of darkness, gloom, and inanity. The frame of man is admirably constituted for the maintenance of the vital functions, in the highest order and degrees of which they are susceptible in this state of existence, and when these are destroyed, nothing is presented to our observation, but the gloomy images of death and extinction. It is true, that the enjoyments of sentient and intellectual life, are mingled with occasional pains, or interrupted by privations; but that mind must be ill constituted, or unfortunately circumstanced, in its passage through, even this brief, precarious existence, which does not perceive its principal end and tendency to be, the production of agreeable and pleasurable perceptions. And notwithstanding the metaphysical subtilties which have aimed to blend life with death, and to represent the apparent extinction of every vital function, as the actual commencement of superior life in its highest vigour and perfection, as its transit into a state of immortal felicity, or of ever-during woe, there is reason to believe, that palpable facts will ever maintain a paramount influence over these imaginative or theoretical creations of the intellect. Whatever occasional allusions there may be in the Scriptures to these refinements, the most express and ordinary representations which they afford of life and death, are those which accord with the observation of our senses, and the prominent impressions and feelings of mankind. Man, we are informed, was made out of the dust of the ground, or of inanimate matter, and it was in consequence of the action of the air upon the organ of respiration, that "he became a living soul."*

* The passage here referred to, is Gen. ii. 7, "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." We read, Job. xxxvii. 10, that "by the breath of God the frost is given," by which phrase, every one understands, the action of the cold wind or air, expressively denominated "*the breath of God;*" and that nothing more is meant, but the action of the air upon the lungs, according to the appointment of God, by his *breathing into man's nostrils the breath of life*, appears pe-

This exactly coincides with our experience, which constantly attests, that every vital function depends on the action of the atmosphere upon this organ. The man thus constituted, is represented as the most excellent of the works of God; and with the length of his days, as well as the extent and correctness of his intellectual and moral attainments, are combined the ideas of favour and felicity. When man dies, on the other hand, it is represented, that he loses his every power, he "returns to his dust," or original inanimation. The sentence passed upon our primitive parent, is very explicit as well as solemn; it is not that the immortal spirit should be separated from the body, and speed its flight either to regions of felicity or of woe; it draws no line of distinction between the man, and the organized frame with which every vital function appears so inseparably combined; but, regarding him as a whole, or a homogeneous person, it emphatically declares, that *he* is dust. "Out of the ground wast *thou* taken; dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou *return*." Had it been true, that the vital principle in Adam was

---

culiarly evident from the more particular description of the *restoration* of life, in Ezekiel xxxvii. After describing the arranging of the bones, and their being furnished with sinews, flesh, and skin, the Prophet observes, that there was no breath in them; upon which he is directed to say, "Come from the four winds, O breath, and breathe upon these slain, that they may live,—and the breath came into them, and they lived, and stood upon their feet." The circumstance of this being only a vision, or scenic representation, can be no objection to the direct evidence which it affords, that it is the action of the air upon the respiratory organs, which, by enabling man to breathe, puts all his vital functions in motion, and thus "he becomes a living soul," or person; for, it must be well known to all who are familiar with the language of the Old Testament, in our common version, that the term *soul* is frequently used for the whole person. At least, if the contrary is maintained, it must be admitted, that it perishes with the body; see Job xxxvi. 14, which is literally rendered "Their soul dieth in youth, and their life is among the unclean;" as in the margin. Soul and life are here used as synonymous terms; and it is evident, that our translators clearly perceived the meaning to be simply the undergoing of a natural death, by their substituting the phrase "*they* die in youth;" see also Ezek. xviii. 4, 20. Indeed, they have used the terms life and soul, in translating the same Hebrew word, as in Gen. i. 20, and ii. 7; in the margin of the former passage, we have the term soul, clearly showing its applicacy to all living creatures, and that it signifies nothing more nor less than the natural life of animals, accompanied, perhaps, with the idea of the organized frame in which it resides. In an excellent commentary upon the passage now under our consideration, Mr. Thom observes, that Parkhurst, in his Lexicon, notwithstanding the known bias of his mind in favour of the separate existence of souls, admits, that the most correct rendering of the phrase, which stands in our common version *a living soul*, would be *a breathing frame*.

immortal, and wholly independent of the corporeal frame and its functions, this sentence must certainly have conveyed to him, and to every unbiassed mind, an idea extremely remote from the truth; nor would the Author of the human frame have represented the man as becoming inanimate earth, when, in reality, his vital powers were only throwing off their terrene impediments, and assuming an immortal vigour. Adam must have known, that his life, or conscious existence, commenced with his bodily conformation, and that previous to this, he was not in being; and he is, by the above sentence, distinctly and emphatically informed, that he will cease to have any conscious existence, or return to the same state of inanimation in which he was, prior to the act of creation.

The Christian doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, is in perfect accordance with the above account of death. Man having become inanimate in the grave, his future existence must evidently depend on that resurrection or restoration from death unto life, which is exemplified in so interesting and satisfactory a manner, by the particulars which are related of the resurrection of Jesus. It has long appeared to me, that those particulars are deserving of a more minute and exact attention than has often been given to them; inasmuch, as they are the representation, not merely of the revival of a dead man to a state of ordinary vitality, but from total inanimation to a state of immortality.

I propose, Sir, with your permission, to review several passages in the Evangelists, containing, I conceive, very abundant and satisfactory evidences, at once, of the resurrection of Jesus, and of his translation to a glorious and immortal state. HOMO.

Unitarian Worthies.—No. 5, Firmin Abauzit.

> Making known
> The might of Truth; and be thy memory cherish'd
> With theirs, the thousands, that around her throne
> Have pour'd their lives out smiling, in that doom,
> Finding a triumph, if denied a tomb.

FIRMIN ABAUZIT was descended from an Arabian Physician, and was born at Usez in Languedoc, in November 1669. He lost his father at two years of age. The edict of Nantz had, at this period, been revoked by Louis XIV.

and his mother suffered grievous persecution at the hands of the Catholics, who wished to force her to bring her son up in the Catholic religion. By a change of residence, she for a long time in vain attempted to escape from the power of her persecutors; and young Abauzit, after many flights, was compelled to wander a long time among the mountains of Cavennes, changing his asylum every time his Bishop discovered the place of his concealment. Once they had invested the house where he was; but the child being put in a pannier along with some goods on an ass, by this stratagem escaped. In the mean time, the mother of young Abauzit was confined in the castle of Samieres, where she experienced the most rigorous treatment, but in vain—her enemies could not compel her to recal her son, whom she had at last safely lodged in the asylum of Geneva. This lady had a fortitude superior to any persecutions, great acuteness of understanding, and a great fund of knowledge. She often declared, "I would never have my son be of a religion that renders men stupid and wicked." Though the health of Madame Abauzit was daily suffering through her protracted confinement, her Bishop, in spite of the entreaties of her physician, refused to release her. But the substitution of his brother in his office, was the means of her liberation; "You wish her to die here (said he, in a letter to the Bishop), but I will not be her executioner." In a dying condition she reached Geneva, and, for the short remainder of her life, devoted herself to the education of her son, teaching him by her example how to profess the truth, to dispense with vain superfluity, and to seek for happiness in the culture of his mind, and the practice of virtue. He made a very rapid progress through all the sciences; his mind accommodated itself to all with the same facility; but natural philosophy, the mathematics, and natural history, had the greatest charms for him. Consecrated to the study of theology, he applied to it with great zeal and eminent success; as an essential requisite, he thoroughly studied the ancient languages, and few persons understood them so well as he did. To finish his education, he travelled in 1689 into Holland, where he became acquainted with the chief literary men. Thence he passed into England, where he was introduced to Sir Isaac Newton, as a young man deeply conversant with mathematical studies. That great man, himself a Unitarian, discerned and appreciated his

merits, and declared Abauzit well worthy to judge on an important question between him and the famous Leibnitz. The reputation of Abauzit became known to King William, who attempted, by a handsome offer, to detain him in England; but he chose to return to Geneva. Here, devoting himself to study, Abauzit, in 1715, entered into a society formed for the purpose of translating the New Testament into French: and the clergy, of whom chiefly the society consisted, acknowledged themselves indebted to him, for useful assistance in this important work. Against Popery, he was always an active and willing opponent. In the year 1726, he lost his mother. Never was a mother more affectionately beloved than she was, and never was a son more tenderly regarded; common suffering had given an unusual closeness to the union of their hearts. His sorrow for her loss, was at first extreme, but time converted it into a gentle melancholy. It was in this year, that he was presented with the privileges and freedom as a citizen of the state of Geneva: he was also importuned to occupy a professor's chair in the University, but his modesty forbade him; he was, however, made librarian. Though possessed of but a small patrimony, he gave up all the emoluments arising from his office; he feared every thing that might in the least abridge his freedom; liberty was ever his great idol, to which he sacrificed his fortune and his worldly fame.

One is astonished at the universality of his knowledge; he was known to the most celebrated mathematicians, philosophers, and divines in Europe; he possessed that understanding which enabled him to appreciate their several excellences, and almost to instruct the most famous of them. To judge of the depth of his physical and mathematical knowledge, it is necessary to know, that he defended Newton against Castel; that he discovered an error in the Principia, at a time when there were few people capable of reading that work, and which Newton corrected in the second edition. Abauzit was one of the first to adopt the grand conceptions of Newton, because his mind was trained so as to see their evidence and beauty. He was perfectly acquainted with many languages; understood with the greatest exactness, ancient and modern geography; and was intimately conversant with medals and manuscripts. All these different sciences, together with a minute knowledge of history, were so well

arranged and digested in his mind, that he could, in an instant, bring together whatever he knew upon any subject. But pre-eminently above all these excellences, stood the moral and religious character of this great man. He was religious by principle, and a Christian from conviction. To the time of his death, he did not cease to defend Christianity; some of his latest days were employed in establishing its evidence, and his works, to which we shall make more particular allusion directly, show how successfully he laboured to discover and set forth the pure milk of the Word. Pious without hypocrisy, virtuous without austerity, he loved mankind; he sought to be useful to them; and he never blamed others for thinking differently from himself. His love of simplicity appeared in all his actions; he shunned ceremony, and retired from flattery. His conversation, always heard with eagerness, was delivered without ostentation. Always himself, he was always the modest—the wise Abauzit.

Voltaire is said to have paid a fine compliment to Abauzit. A stranger having said to the Poet of Ferney, that he was come to Geneva to see a great man, Voltaire asked him if he had seen Abauzit. From another contemporary, we may also gather an idea of the excellences of our worthy; the famous Rousseau has presented a true portrait of him, the more valuable because incidentally introduced in a note in his New Heloise. "Not that this philosophical age has not produced one philosopher: I knew one, and I must confess, but one; but the happiest circumstance is, that he resides in my native country. Shall I venture publicly to name him, whose honour it is to have remained unknown? Yes, learned and modest Abauzit! let your sublime simplicity forgive my zeal, which, to say the truth, hath not your name for its object. No, it is not you I would make known in an age unworthy to admire you—it is Geneva I would honour, by making it known as the place of your residence—it is my fellow-citizens who are honoured by your presence. Happy the country, where the merit that conceals itself, is by so much the more esteemed! happy the country, among whom presumptuous and forward youth is ashamed of its dogmatic insolence, and blushes at its vain knowledge, before the learning of age! Venerable and virtuous old man! you have never been praised by babbling wits; no noisy academician has written your eulogium. Instead of de-

positing like them all their wisdom in books, you have displayed it in your life, as an example to the country you have deigned to make the object of your esteem. You have lived like Socrates; but he died by the hands of his fellow-citizens, while you are cherished by yours." The valuable man and true Christian to whom these testimonies were given, died, lamented by the Republic, and regretted by the learned, in the year 1757, at the advanced age of 87 years.

Abauzit left behind him some writings, chiefly theological and critical; a collection of these, published originally in French, was translated into our language by Dr. Harwood. This volume has become exceedingly scarce, and we should be happy to see a reprint of it. In so saying, we have given our opinion of the pieces it contains; of these, the principal is an Essay upon the Apocalypse, written to show, that the canonical authority of the book of Revelation is doubtful; to which treatise even the learned Michaelis acknowledges himself indebted. Some minor pieces, treat "on Idolatry," "on the Mysteries of Religion, &c." This last essay is highly valuable. It would not be difficult to draw the portrait of Abauzit, from the pictures which are displayed in his works; but we must content ourselves with one or two quotations.

After some disquisitions respecting the consequences of the first transgression, no less original than solid, he thus concludes, in his own modest and simple manner, "I propose here these brief reflections only as mere conjectures, to afford a theme for debate and the investigation of truth. If my sentiments are just, they will disembarrass theology from an infinite number of useless questions. God preserve us all from bigotry and religious prejudice." In his reply to a Professor, whose name is not given, who had published a letter attempting to prove the Deity of Christ, from Rom. ix. 5, occurs the following forcible passage:—"Now, if Jesus Christ was God, is it conceivable that the Scriptures would have chosen to make use of expressions so equivocal—expressions which would have a tendency to overthrow a doctrine of this importance, which would put men in imminent danger of being saved? What would the orthodox say of a man, who, in his discourse, should very frequently declare that Jesus Christ is not eternal—that Jesus Christ is not omnipotent—that Jesus Christ does not know all things—that Jesus did not create

the heavens and the earth? It would be in vain for him sometimes to ascribe to Jesus attributes of divinity, he would not fail to pass for a heretic; they would pretend, that if he were thoroughly convinced that Jesus Christ was God, he would talk in a different strain. Why do they not make the same judgment in regard to Scripture? If Jesus Christ was God, would it speak so frequently of him as a man inferior to his Father—as a man who holds every thing at his hands? The Scripture, in using the language of the Unitarians, does it not authorize their principles? Why blame so heinously in individuals, expressions which occasion no trouble when we find them in the Scripture? Why study to elude, by an unnatural distinction, the clear and natural sense which exhibits itself in those passages? They ought, at least, to grant, that from the reflections which they make to justify these expressions of Scripture, which represent Jesus Christ to us as inferior to his Father—they ought, I say, to grant that the Unitarians are authorized in speaking as they do of Jesus Christ, that Jesus Christ is not omnipotent. The Unitarians may then say, that Jesus Christ does not know every thing, that Jesus Christ did not create the heavens and the earth. They will hence follow a mode of speaking approved by the orthodox; they will adopt the style of Scripture; no one will have any reason to be offended with this language. One must perhaps say on this subject, what an orthodox man said with regard to the subjects of grace, one *must preach like an Arminian, and believe like a Calvinist*—so here, one must speak with the Unitarians, and believe with the Orthodox. Who does not see, however, whither sentiments of this kind lead?"

G. C. S.

Letters addressed to a small Unitarian Congregation, by their former Minister.

LETTER I.

To the Society of Unitarian Christians at B———.

Christian Brethren,

The recollection of days that are past, when we were happily united together as minister and people, brings to my mind the remembrance of those pure and exalted pleasures, which we mutually enjoyed from the exercises

of virtuous friendship and social devotion. Though Providence has cast my lot far from you, do not suppose that either time or distance can efface from my memory the many tokens of respect and affection which you manifested towards me, and which are engraven on my heart. I often think of you with feelings of delight, and to give you a token of this my remembrance, and to evince the ardent desire I have for the promotion of your moral and spiritual interests, I have resolved to write you a series of letters on subjects of vital importance. I request you to read them with serious attention, and to resolve, by divine assistance, to realize in your own minds, the purifying and consoling influences of the great and immortal truths of uncorrupted Christianity. I shall treat the subjects which come before me with the greatest plainness, so that you may easily perceive my meaning. In short, I shall aim to bring home to your hearts the importance and practical influences of the leading principles of your Christian faith; and doubt not, if you are led to consider the subject in the same light with myself, that you will be more strongly convinced that Unitarianism, when properly understood and heartily embraced, is most admirably calculated to form an elevated religious character—a character that shall progressively improve on earth, and be susceptible of a gradual *elevation* in excellence through endless ages.

You are, my brethren, separated from the rest of the religious world, by the profession of certain doctrines which the greater part of professing Christians regard as unscriptural, and not a few of them, as incompatible with salvation. I shall not here adduce the scriptural evidence, though that would be no difficult task, of these views of religious truth, which we have seen reason to adopt; but shall endeavour to point out some of their practical bearings on the heart and life. This, I consider, the most effectual way of stopping the mouths of gainsayers, and of putting to silence those who would call in question the purity of our motives and the integrity of our hearts.

I would now, my brethren, just remind you, of the leading principles of your faith. You believe *in the strict unity and spirituality of the Deity*—that God is one—one mind—one omniscient spirit—who fills immensity with his presence. This is the basis of your creed: the foundation, indeed, both of natural and revealed religion. You also believe "*God is love*"—that he is the Father of

all mankind—that they are his children—the objects of his care—the recipients of his goodness—the subjects of his government, and the probationers for immortality. You likewise admit, with the most unshaken confidence, the divine claims of the Lord Jesus Christ, whom you believe to be "the way, the truth, and the life." Him, you gratefully receive as the messenger of truth and peace—as the herald of mercy and forgiveness—as the conqueror of death—and as the Saviour of the world. You believe that the chief object of the Redeemer's mission, was to open a new and better way by which the sinner might be reconciled to God, and which is effected "not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, which he shed on us abundantly, through Jesus Christ our Saviour, in whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his (God's) grace." These are the simple elements of your faith. It is an important inquiry, then, what influence should they have on your minds—what feelings should they create in your hearts? I intend to answer this inquiry, to the best of my ability.

And first, my brethren, allow me to observe, that the mere assent of the understanding to the reasonableness and truth of the principles just stated, is not of itself sufficient to exhibit their genuine moral effects. If you are influenced only by the cold approval of reason, you are yet strangers to that pure and fervent affection towards God, which should always pervade the bosom, and which your views of religious truth are pre-eminently calculated to produce. Let your religion, then, have not only the assent of the understanding, but the warm reception of the heart. Then, and not till then, can you experience its genuine influence, and enjoy its rich and unspeakable consolations. You believe in the proper Unity of the Divine Being; that he only has a claim to our purest affections and highest gratitude; and that *he alone* is to be worshipped. But how seldom, comparatively, does this great truth in all its numerous and important bearings, influence our conduct! How often, I might almost say, how constantly, do earthly objects occupy our thoughts; even whilst professedly engaged in acts of devotion, how frequently do they arrest the attention, and destroy the harmony of spiritual intercourse! This propensity of our nature, the best of men have lamented; it will necessarily

attach itself to us in the present state of things; but it is capable, in many instances, of receiving counteraction. But in order to this, it is indispensably necessary that you become acquainted with your own moral deficiencies. Ask yourselves the question—Have I always set God before me, as the chief object of my desire?—does he invariably hold the highest place in my affections and my heart?—are the things of this world kept subordinate to the great concerns of religion?—in short, am I not sometimes more anxious about the transitory objects of this life, than in preparing for that which is to come? These, I need not say, are great questions. They concern us all. Answer them, from the honest simplicity of your hearts. And in whatever part of your conduct you find that too much time has been occupied by trifling and foolish cares, resolve for the future to employ that time in cultivating a better acquaintance with yourselves, with each other, and above all, with your God.

As Unitarians, you hold the doctrine of the *spirituality* of God, as essential to just and honourable conceptions of the divine perfections. Maintain this truth inviolate. It is the soul of an elevated piety, the essence of true religion. Reflect upon its powerful and beneficial influence upon the mind. How admirably does the conviction, that God is purely a spirit—in us—above us—and around us, awe us with a sense of the divine presence, and thus preserve us from doing evil in his sight! I know of no better preservative against the contamination of sin, than a practical belief in the spirituality of the Almighty.

Farther, you believe in the paternity of the divine character; that God is indeed the Father of his creatures, in a much higher and more endearing sense than that in which any earthly parent sustains the relation. This I have always considered the most attractive feature in the views which you have adopted. That God is our heavenly Father—that he loves us with a Father's love, and watches over us with a Father's care—is indeed a pleasing and refreshing thought! Under the afflictions and bereavements of this changeful state, a well grounded belief in the fatherly character of God, is human nature's best solace, "an anchor for the soul, sure and steadfast." Have you, my brethren, realised these sentiments in your own minds —do you *feel* your relation to God *as a Father*—are you willing to commit all things to his care and keeping—are

you conscious of your entire dependence upon *Him* for every blessing you enjoy—and are you desirous of doing his will, as obedient children? You must answer these questions, each one for himself. But I cannot omit to tell you, that much, very much, depends upon the nature of the answer you are able to give. You know that God, like all wise parents, requires gratitude and obedience in his children. This he has a right to expect, and this he requires at your hands. Ingratitude and disobedience he will severely punish; for wrath, tribulation, and anguish, awaiteth every soul that doeth evil. Be careful, then, my brethren, that you do not remain insensible to the blessings you enjoy; that you do not abuse the invaluable privileges with which you are surrounded; but that you diligently seek the approbation of your heavenly Father, by a cheerful compliance with his requests, and a willing obedience to his laws. There is one rich consolation that flows from the views you have taken of the divine character, which I cannot omit to mention; and it is this: However severe the chastisements of God may appear, we know that in his hands they are corrective and remedial, and are designed by wisdom which cannot err, and by goodness which cannot be unkind, to promote our improvement and happiness. Learn, then, cheerfully to acquiesce in the righteousness of all the dispensations of his Providence, and let the prayer of your hearts be, "Thy will, O God! be done!"

To be resign'd when ills betide,
Patient when favours are denied,
And pleas'd with favours given:
This, gracious God! is wisdom's part:
This is that incense of the heart,
Whose fragrance reaches heaven.

There is one more great topic to which I request your most serious attention, and that is, the divine mission and work of the Lord Jesus Christ. This forms a prominent part of your creed, and is a truth which you have embraced, I hope, with the most devout gratitude. If there be any thing that has a claim upon your best feelings, it is that divine almighty love, which sent the only begotten Son of God into the world, "that whosoever believeth in him might not perish, but have everlasting life." Only reflect, my brethren, on the vast importance of the objects for which your Saviour lived, and for which he died. He came to call sinners to repentance—to give deliverance

to the captive—to bind up the broken-hearted—to preach the gospel to the poor—and to promote peace upon earth and good-will towards men. Is he not, then, worthy your confidence, gratitude, and praise? A character that accomplished these great objects, ought to be held in grateful and everlasting remembrance.

As you believe that Jesus Christ is an all-sufficient Saviour, and that "there is no other name given among men whereby we must be saved," it is of the greatest importance that you not only acquiesce in this interesting and momentous truth, but that you feel also the *need* of those peculiar blessings which it imparts. Without such a conviction of your own deficiencies and wants, you will never, I fear, be induced to go to the Saviour in earnest, to seek him in penitence and tears, and to apply the balm which flows from his redemption, to the healing of every moral wound. Let me, therefore, entreat you, as you value your salvation and eternal happiness, to examine yourselves—to prove yourselves—to see whether you are in that narrow path which leadeth unto life—whether you are building upon the true foundation: for, recollect, the principles you have embraced, teach, "that other foundation can no man lay, than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ." I am aware, that many who are averse to the Unitarian doctrine, assert that we make nothing of Jesus Christ—that he holds a very subordinate place in our creed. This assertion, common as it is, must proceed from a total ignorance of our real principles. To us, Jesus Christ is every thing that God, his Father, hath made him—our Instructor, Exemplar, Intercessor, Redeemer, and Judge! We look to him as the grand *medium* through which all spiritual blessings and consolations flow, from the exhaustless Fountain of divine purity and love. We consider his death, not indeed as the procuring cause of our salvation, but simply as the *means* which the Divine Being employed, in order to ratify the new and everlasting Covenant, which teaches, "that by grace we are saved," and that "God hath not appointed us to wrath, but to obtain salvation through our Lord Jesus Christ." Whatever our opponents may say as to our degrading Christ, I call upon you, my brethren, to refute the odious charge, which ignorance or bigotry may prefer, by your religious and upright lives. Console yourselves under all the stigmas that may be cast upon your profession, by the ani-

mating words of our blessed Saviour:—"He that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me; and he that loveth me, shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him, and will manifest myself to him." In fine, convince the world, that you are alive to the interests of undefiled religion—that you feel and live under its heavenly influences—that you honour *Him* whom the Father hath sent, by embracing every opportunity of advancing the great Cause in which you are engaged—which is the cause of Truth and Reason, Virtue and Humanity—man's highest happiness, and God's eternal glory.

I remain, CHRISTIAN BRETHREN,

Sincerely and affectionately yours, G. B.

To the Editor of the Christian Pioneer.

SIR,

A sense of what is due to myself, requires me to make a few remarks on a note which you have appended to a Review, from my pen, of the life and character of Dr. Parr. You have greatly mistaken my meaning, in imagining, as you appear to have done, that the few words of eulogy with which I closed my remarks, related to the adherence or non-adherence of Dr. Parr, to the Established Church. My feelings, at the time, were directed in quite a different channel—to the transcendent excellence of mind and of heart, which the Life, by Mr. Field, and especially the second volume, shows that Dr. Parr possessed. I was warmed by admiration of the powers of his vigorous intellect, and the tenderness and enlargement of his well governed heart. The exhibition of such excellences cannot fail "to vindicate our much defamed nature;" and I feel it a good thing to be a man, when, by such a title, I am associated with individuals of like qualities with Dr. Parr. And though I have been educated in a school, which teaches to rely on no man's opinions, yet I am free to confess, that when I find persons possessed of learning so profound and accurate, of judgments so disciplined and matured, of hearts so benevolent and liberal, as was the learning, the judgment, and the heart of Dr. Parr; led, notwithstanding the prejudices and predilections created by early influences—in opposition to the current of interest—to the adoption of Unitarian Christianity, I cannot

but feel, that "a testimony" has been given to the truth of those sentiments, which, with far inferior advantages, I have been led to espouse. Seeing such things, I feel "a comfort and a support" to my mind, and thanking God, I take courage. What, then? in saying this, am I "praising the conduct of those who cannot afford to keep a conscience?" By what mighty leap of inference, could the Editor of the Christian Pioneer, have been led to this conclusion? Much as I admire the character of Dr. Parr, there are many things beside his adherence to the Church, which I regret; but why display all his imperfections?—had you space for a *full* portrait of the man? I take for granted, that every one knew that Dr. Parr was not an angel, but *a man*; and I felt a pleasure in showing, that he was a good man, and an ornament to his race. But, you reply, he should have left the Church. I will say, I wish he had left the Church, while I also maintain, that he was at least as good a judge as you or I, of what he ought to have done. You will bear in mind, that while he believed in One God, the Father, he was devotedly attached to an Establishment. He was therefore between two difficulties: if he left the Church, he sacrificed a principle—if he remained in it, he did the same. What wonder, if he continued in his station, thus acted upon by two opposing forces, and did his best to bring about a reform of doctrine and discipline. However, whether right or wrong, this certainly was his inducement—*he thought he could do more good by remaining where he was.* I regret that he did adhere to the Church, but I condemn not—I judge no one's servant; to his own Master he standeth or falleth. But I cannot hear Dr. Parr taxed with being ashamed "of the obloquy attendant on virtuous consistency," nor ranked among those who cannot "afford to keep a conscience," without entering my protest against such unwarranted language. Had Dr. Parr made an approximation to the character you describe, he would, Sir, have sat upon the Episcopal bench, and perhaps enjoyed the proudest honours of the hierarchy. But throughout the whole of his life, he was a staunch and consistent friend, in public and in private, of liberal measures in politics, and enlightened sentiments and judicious reforms, and charitable judgments in theology. By his pen, by his purse, by his tongue, he defended whatever was holy, generous, and liberal. He was not merely a defender of the good cause of human

rights, but a *prominent* defender; his disposition propelled him to the very front of the battle; and that, too, though he well knew that all that was requisite for his advancement to honours and emoluments, was not the surrender of his sentiments, but a little more discretion and a little less zeal. I rejoice that he was what he was—better he might have been: but if we are to wait for perfection before we praise, the example of the wise and good will be lost, and their influence will die away in the day that they perish. Once more I say, I wish he had left the Church; but for not doing so, I dare not condemn him.

Before reading the note on which I have animadverted, I had transcribed for the Pioneer, one of the letters which Dr. Parr sent to Archbishop Magee, in defence of Unitarians. This I beg you to insert immediately after these remarks, and your readers will then be better able to judge of the character of the learned divine, and will also see how far he was ashamed of "obloquy." A volunteer in defence of an obnoxious sect, against the charges of an archbishop, either could afford to keep a conscience, or most lamentably mistook his vocation. G. C. S.

From Dr. Parr to Dr. Magee, Archbishop of Dublin.

HATTON, *Sept.* 25, 1823.

MY LORD,

THOUGH differing widely from your Grace upon some important subjects of controversial Theology, I hold, and therefore always shall avow, a very high opinion of your talents and attainments. With much pleasure have I read two of the Charges which your Grace has lately published. I have praised them in the hearing, and recommended them to the perusal, of some enlightened clergymen. I found in them very useful matter, and very splendid diction. But, with surprise, and with concern, I observed, that, in one of them, your Grace has spoken sweepingly of the Unitarians as illiterate. The expression, my Lord, astonished me, and called to my mind the language which Cicero, in his celebrated speech for Ligarius, employed about the cause of Pompey; and which, *mutatis mutandis*, I shall apply to your severe and contemptuous animadversion upon a well-known, and, perhaps, increasing sect. Speaking of Unitarianism, "*alii errorem appellant, qui durius, pertinacium, qui gravissime, impietatem—αμαθιαν præter te adhuc nemo.*"* In a dispute, which, about 150 years ago, was carried on with great violence, Bishop Wet-

* Some charge them with error; others, speaking harshly of them, with pertinacity; and others, in great severity, with impiety; but no one, except you, has yet charged them with ignorance.

tenhall wrote a very judicious, candid, and conciliatory pamphlet, which I found in a huge mass of controversial writings, in which he describes the Socinians* as active, as zealous, as acute, as dexterous in disputation, as blameless in the general tenor of their lives, and, he adds, even pious, with exception to their own peculiar tenets. Every man of common sense, my Lord, will perceive, that the qualifying words are the result of discretion and episcopal decorum, and were intended, probably, for a kind of sop to soften the Cerberean part of the priesthood. Be this as it may, the representation which Bishop Wettenhall gave of his Socinian contemporaries, corresponds nearly with my own observations upon my own Unitarian contemporaries.

Now, my Lord, I know nothing either by report, or my own reading, about the number of Unitarians in Ireland, or their writings, or their erudition, or their want of erudition. I, at the same time, am justified in saying, that among my own learned acquaintance in this country, there is not one teacher in the established Church, whom I could safely pronounce a Unitarian. Without the pale of that Church, indeed, there are several Unitarians with whom I think it an honour to be acquainted; and I shall make no apology for introducing into this letter their names, and avowing the sincere respect which I feel for their intellectual powers, their literary attainments, and their moral worth. Let us look round a little, my Lord. Will any scholar apply the word, "illiterate," to Grotius, or to Le Clerc? These are the distinguished Unitarians of former days. I have not been a slovenly reader of the Fratres Poloni; and I could mention the names of several persons whose tenets seem to me erroneous, but whom I should not dare to call illiterate. In the last century, lived Dr. Lardner, Dr. John Jebb, Mr. John Baines of Trinity College, Cambridge, the friend of Sir Samuel Romilly, and an academic distinguished in his day, for his proficiency in science, and his skill in classical learning. Perhaps Edmund Law, Bishop of Carlisle, may, without injustice, be supposed to look upon Unitarianism, rather with a favourable eye towards the close of a studious life. Was Bishop Law illiterate? Was Dr. John Taylor of Norwich, illiterate? And, slender as might be the pretences of Dr. Priestley and Theophilus Lindsey to any critical accuracy in the languages, or to any delicate taste of the elegancies of profane authors, Greek and Latin, yet their attention to Scriptural Greek, though it did not preserve them from what you think heresy, was more than sufficient to protect them from the application of illiterate. Was the late Duke of Grafton illiterate? Were the writers of the Free and Candid Disquisitions illiterate? I was not personally acquainted with the late Mr. Cappe of York, but his writings furnish abundant proofs of eloquence,

* The appellation Socinian, might have been taken from the Socini, a family which submitted to voluntary exile from Sienna, with Lactantio Pagnoni and Mino Celso, on account of the persecutions they suffered for having adopted the reformed opinions in religion; as well as from the writer Socinus.—*M'Crie's History of the Reformation in Italy.*

acuteness, and, I add, erudition. Was Encedinus illiterate? Is Wegscheider illiterate? Was Semler illiterate? Is Eichorn illiterate? Let me not pass by some dissenting clergymen, who are avowedly Unitarians, and upon whose claims, to be considered as scholars, I can speak, and, therefore, do speak, with confidence. Mr. Berry of Leicester, who, to Greek and Latin erudition, adds no inconsiderable portion of oriental; Mr. Cogan, a Schoolmaster at Walthamstow, whom, from conversation and correspondence, I know to be an accurate Greek scholar, and a diligent and discriminating reader of the best critical books, which have, of late, been published at Berlin, Leyden, Gothingen, Leipsic, and Paris; and at home, by Porson, Blomfield, Gaisford, Elmsley, &c. Is Cogan illiterate? No, no. My mind passes on to Mr. Corrie of Birmingham, who not only is well acquainted with Natural Philosophy, and is a fine writer of English prose, but has an exquisite taste for the compositions of Greek and Roman writers, and is a reader of what Bentley, Dawes, and Toup, have written upon philology. My neighbour, Mr. Yates of Birmingham, is one of the most studious men I know. I have seen his admirable collection of books; and I consider him as a diligent and intelligent reader of the most abstruse and elaborate writings of Theologians, both in Greek and Latin. Mr. Robberds of Manchester, had a classical education in Norwich School. He is an excellent writer of English prose; and can such a man be called illiterate? It becomes me, after many interviews, to bear my testimony to the merit of Mr. Shepherd of Liverpool, and, in truth, so far as classical learning is concerned, his proficiency would do him honour, if he sat upon the episcopal bench. My Lord, from motives of delicacy, I will not enlarge upon the learning of Mr. Belsham. He neither understands, nor professes to understand, very critically, those profane authors who are taught in our public Schools, and our two Universities: yet I think and speak respectfully of his biblical learning; and I am pretty sure, that Archbishop Newcome, if he were now living, would, upon this subject, speak and think as I do. In my own neighbourhood, lives a lineal descendant of Oliver Cromwell.* He does not pretend to be a profound classic, but he is largely furnished with general knowledge; he is a diligent reader of the Greek Testament; he has great dexterity in reasoning; he excels in clearness and vigour of style; he is not contentious; he is not conceited; but upon two or three occasions, when provoked by insulting calumnies against himself and his sect, he has confuted and silenced some accusers, whose orthodoxy was not accompanied by a due share of sense, learning, or moderation. Your Grace will do me the justice to observe, that I mean not directly, or indirectly, to defend the heretical opinions adopted by any of the worthies whom I have enumerated. But I should say of them, whether I adverted to them in the senate, or from the pulpit, or from the press,—yes, my Lord, I should say in the hearing of all the conclaves, and all the convocations in Chris-

* Rev. W. Field, Unitarian Minister, Warwick.

tendom, *utinam essent nostri.** I hope, therefore, my Lord, and if you were not an Archbishop, I should advise, that, in some future edition of your excellent charge, you would withdraw the word, "illiterate." There are many other points upon which your sagacity, learning, and eloquence, may be employed with the greatest propriety, and far better effect. If you were more intimately acquainted with myself, you would find that no man is more ready to bestow prompt, sincere, and ample praise upon the talents and the learning, which the ecclesiastics of the Established Church have, in our own days, displayed in the defence of their tenets. Glad I am, that so large a part of that praise falls to the share of the distinguished Prelate to whom I now writing. In natural religion, and in revealed, there are some truths bright as the sun in meridian, and solid as adamant itself; but in both, there are *quæstiones per difficiles et per obscuræ*, upon which a man of reflection will often think it his right and his duty, επεχειν,† and will apply to speculation, what has been well said of practice:

> Nunquam ita quisquam bene subducta ratione ad vitam fuit,
> Quin res, ætas, usus semper aliquid adportet novi;
> Aliquid moneat, ut illa quæ te scire credas, nescias:
> Et quæ tibi putaris prima, in experiundo ut repudies.‡

For more than 50 years, I have attended diligently and seriously to Theology; at *me ipsum, quondam et animi quodam impetu concitatum, et vi naturæ elatum, et recentibus præceptorum studiis flagrantem, dies tandem aliquando leniit, ætas mitigavit.*§ As to the conflicts in which other men are engaged, I cannot, from habit, and perhaps nature, be a careless spectator, but being far advanced in my 77th year, I am upon my guard against the perils to which partisans are exposed; and, as a lover of letters, and a religionist, I am content γηρᾰ́σκειν αιει πολλα διδασκομενος.‖

The Editor of the Christian Pioneer may have misunderstood the remarks of the Reviewer of Dr. Parr's Life, and if so, the Note in the last Number was unnecessary; but it then seemed, and still seems to him, that the Reviewer held up the character of Dr. Parr, in his religious principles and conduct, as entitled to unqualified admiration. Dr. Parr was asserted to hold "the Divine Unity in the strictest sense"—to have "abjured all the strange

---

* I wish they were ours.

† Duty—to suspend his judgment.

‡ No one has ever been so completely equipped for the duties of life, but that circumstances, the lapse of time, and experience, furnishes something new; admonishing you that you are ignorant of what you imagined you knew, and to reject in practice, what you have deemed fundamental principles.

§ But at length time hath softened, and the experience of age mitigated, the impetuosity of my spirit, and the predominant force of my nature and genius, as well as the recent impressions of philosophy.

‖ To grow old, constantly increasing my knowledge.

and astounding doctrines of original sin, hereditary depravity, arbitrary election, and eternal reprobation"—"his views of ecclesiastical reform" were said to be "carried" "to a full and proper extent"—"religious candour," it was affirmed, "never appeared upon earth in a purer spirit or under a more engaging form"—in Dr. Parr "there was the stirring and active life of Christian charity"—he vindicated," by his principles and conduct, "our common and much defamed nature"—and his "testimony" to the truth of Unitarianism, not only gave weight to its evidences, but "no little comfort and support" to the minds of its advocates. Now it did, and does appear to the Editor, that had he allowed these statements to go forth to the world in the Christian Pioneer, without note or comment, he would have been guilty of a dereliction of duty. It was once remarked by Dr. Wardlaw, that as to those persons who are said to be Unitarians, but still continue members of Trinitarian churches, the Unitarians may claim as much honour as they think they derive, from their sentiments. They are welcome to as many hypocrites as they choose to say belong to them. But it is surely paying their principles but a left-handed sort of compliment, thus to acknowledge they have not power sufficient to make their believers honest men. In the spirit of these observations, the Editor perfectly coincides. More injury is done to the cause of truth by such temporizing, such moral delinquency, than by the most strenuous efforts of bigotry and fanaticism. There has been too great a fondness for this mustering of names. The questions are not what Doctor this, or Bishop that, might in speculation admire and talk about, but what declares Reason? what say the Scriptures? To live, if possible, in habits of intimacy—of friendship, with persons of different religious opinions is useful—is a duty; but to regard it as a mighty honour, should a Churchman or a Church Dignitary visit a Dissenter, is to exhibit a deference to prevailing and established error, which is not consistent with unswerving principle. The dissenters have injured their cause, and lowered themselves in public estimation, by this feeling. Instead of claiming men as belonging to the Unitarian faith, who, even in private letters to Archbishops, denominate that faith "heretical," the lesson that should constantly be inculcated, is, Religious integrity.

The Editor would not indeed have gone out of his way

to attack, what he deems, the erroneous practice of Dr. Parr. His noble conduct, in relation to the outrages at Birmingham—his admirable defence, though anonymous, of the calumniated Priestley—and his affectionate adherence, during trouble and persecution, to Joseph Gerald—the Editor highly honours. But when he considered what might have been effected, by the moral honesty of Dr. Parr's public relinquishment of the emoluments of a Church, whose doctrines he is said to have called absurd, and beheld him retaining those emoluments, and serving at that altar, thereby throwing the weight of his name, and learning, and talents, and character, into what he confessedly thought the scale of error, the Editor deemed that all this very much resembled the conduct of one who could not afford to keep a conscience. The perusal of the letter, not before printed, it is presumed, to the Archbishop of Dublin, has not altered the Editor's opinion. Dr. Parr vindicates some of the Unitarians, indeed, from the charge of being illiterate; but he specially guards against the Primate's supposing, that he either directly or indirectly sanctions their "heretical opinions." He rejoices in the talents with which the clergy of the Church of England have, of late years, defended their tenets, and he is highly pleased, that a large share of applause falls to the lot of Dr. Magee, the most bitter and virulent defamer of Unitarians and Unitarianism. Could Dr. Parr be a Unitarian Christian, and honestly write such passages? If he were, is not the Editor's opinion justified by Dr. Parr's own language? In perusing the lives of Benjamin Goodier, of Thacher, of Theophilus Lindsey, the Editor feels the moral, the sanctifying, the benevolent tendency of the faith which guided and blessed these excellent individuals. They bowed before the majesty of truth, and illustrated by their lives its sacred influences. They knew in whom they had believed, and their practice gave additional force to that precept, which, in this age of indifferentism and spurious liberality, is more than ever necessary to be constantly held up before the professing Christian world, "He who walketh uprightly, walketh surely."

The Editor is sorry that G. C. S. should have written a letter, which seems to him to be so unlike his usual productions. "All his imperfections," it was certainly not necessary, when writing of Dr. Parr, to communicate to the world; but a faithful portrait was needful. When

bestowing upon the Doctor, it may be, well-deserved praise, it was necessary, the Editor conceives, to caution the readers, that Dr. Parr's name and character did not lead *them* also to think with the wise, and act with the vulgar. It was right to add, that the only consistent and Christian conduct, was, "to esteem the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures of Egypt." Condemnation, when uncalled for, is surely improper, but not less so is indiscriminate praise. To pass in silence the errors of the departed, is to lose the benefits of experience—is to injure the living, for the sake of saying nothing but good of the dead. This the Editor esteems to be misplaced delicacy, and even G. C. S., though he dare not condemn Dr. Parr, has no such scruples, when it is only the Editor of the Christian Pioneer who is concerned. Dr. Parr might, for aught the Editor knows, have sat on the Episcopal bench, though it does not follow, that those who cannot afford to keep a conscience, are necessarily among that class whom the King thus delighteth to honour, otherwise he to whose name those words are attached, richly merited such a distinction, if only for his chapter on conformity and subscription.

The Editor closes the subject, by reminding G. C. S. that they have but one object in view—the promotion of pure and undefiled religion. In the accomplishment of this purpose, it is probable they may choose different means. In this they should agree to differ. Difficulties and discouragements, it will be allowed, present themselves on every side. Let not Unitarians add to these, by looking with any feeling but disapprobation, and it may sometimes be, pity, on those who adhere to error, whilst believing in truth. The world has had enough of this tampering with conscience—this speaking deceitfully for God. The stern, uncompromising front of virtuous integrity, may displease the bigot, and alarm the timid; the indifferentist may sneer at it, and the worldling may scoff; but it is the only conduct which will render a Christian truly useful and consistent, and manifest to all, that he has a right to be deemed a disciple of that Saviour who declared, that he who should prefer houses and lands before him—he who is ashamed of Christ and his words before men, shall not enjoy the blessedness of the kingdom of purity, and honesty, and truth.

THE CHRISTIAN PIONEER.

GLASGOW, *December* 1, 1828.

IN our Number for October, we gave a short notice of the Third Anniversary of the American Unitarian Association. By the kind attention of the Domestic Secretary of the Association, the Rev. E. S. Gannet of Boston, we have been favoured with the Second and Third Annual Reports. They are very interesting. Considering the short period in which the Association has been in operation, its efforts have been laudably active. It has published twenty-three Tracts, the various editions of which, exceed 143,000 copies; employed an individual on a mission of inquiry into the state of religious feeling and principle, who was engaged five months, and during that period, passed through 12 States, visited 15 Counties in Pennsylvania, 25 in Ohio, 12 in Kentucky, 22 in Indiana, 12 in Illinois, and 2 in Missouri, and travelled between 4000 and 5000 miles. The Association has also employed in occasional missionary labours, the Rev. Messrs. Kay, Peirce, Hall, Bailey, Farr, and Whitwell, in Maine and in Pennsylvania, Hampshire, Berkshire, and Franklin counties, in Massachusets. The Association has also taken the direction of the labours of the Rev. Dr. Tuckerman, who ministers entirely to the poor families in Boston, who are unconnected with any religious society. The contributions to his labours, are supplied by the ladies in several of the Unitarian Congregations of that City. Dr. Tuckerman's reports are peculiarly interesting, his labours evidently beneficial; and they have already been blessed, in many instances, to the recovery of the slaves of intemperance and vice. During the past year, Dr. Tuckerman has regularly visited nearly 170 families, his missionary visits amounting to about 1930. Schools have been opened, lectures to the children given on Thursday afternoons, and the Sunday evening worship for the poor well attended. This is a plan well deserving imitation on this side the Atlantic. Many are the individuals and families, who might be rescued from iniquity and wretchedness in every large town, by the adoption of measures for their improvement and virtue. A Library in connexion with the Association, has been instituted. The funds of the Society this year, exceed 4000 dollars,

and the prospect of support increases. Thirty-five Auxiliary Associations, have been formed in connexion with the Parent establishment, and Agents for the sale and distribution of the Society's books, have been appointed in 45 different towns.

From Mr. Thomas's Journal we make a few extracts. The first shows the importance of efforts to disabuse the minds of the people, of those calumnies so incessantly inculcated as to Unitarian principles:—

"At Morristown, 11 miles, I stopped to rest my horse. Here a circumstance took place, the relation of which, I trust, needs no apology. I was making inquiries of the aged inn-keeper concerning the Christian denominations in the place, and among others, I asked him if there were any Unitarians; 'What!' says he, "you don't call them Christians!' 'Yes, Sir, I do.' 'Why, folks say here, they are Deists.' 'Do you know, Sir, what they profess?' 'No: they don't believe any thing.' I then handed him a little book containing the Unitarian faith; after he had read it, I asked him how he liked it. He said there was no hurt in it; it was like his Bible."

What a contrast is afforded by the two following passages!—With what gratitude should the Christian Unitarian look up to the Father of lights, and bless him for the deliverance from error and fanaticism! Mr. Sarjent is a member of "The Free Church," and decidedly Unitarian.

"On looking over my memoranda, I find a request, that I would visit Mr. Sarjent, who, I incidently heard, was resident near West Union, on Brush Creek, Ohio, superintending the publication of his paper, which is executed at the West Union press. He also has a society 7 miles out of town. On Sunday, May 28th, I attended his meeting, where I found a congregation assembled, to the number of 48 or 50. I entered their small one-story log meeting-house, with the old man, who shook hands with his people as he passed to the opposite side of the room, where a bench, made by splitting a log and setting up part of it on four pegs, was appropriated to his use. After he had seated himself, he took his saddle-bags across his knees, and drew out a bundle nicely rolled up in a piece of deerskin, which proved to be his Bible and Hymn-book. After a few impressive remarks on the occasion for which we were assembled, he commenced his services by reading and singing a hymn, at the close of which the whole congregation knelt in prayer. As the old man raised his eyes and withered hands towards heaven, his white locks fell back on his shoulders, and he seemed like devotion personified. He continued in prayer nearly an hour, during which time, there was neither shouting nor groaning; the only responses were occasional amens, uttered in tones of deep devotional feeling. After the prayer, he continued to speak for two or three hours, during which time, many of them felt the want of temporal as well as spiritual food, and drew forth

their several budgets of provision, which they very quietly disposed of. I joined them in the concluding prayer, and I can truly say that I never felt in a more devotional frame, than while thus worshipping that Being, who accepts our heart-rendered services, whether offered beneath a vaulted dome, or a brush-thatched hovel."

At Cincinnati Mr. Thomas attended a Trinitarian prayer meeting.

"One evening, as I was walking the streets, I heard screams, as though several people were in distress: I hastened to the place whence the noise came, and found near 100 persons, men, women, and children, assembled at a prayer-meeting. They prayed and sung alternately. While one was praying, others encouraged him with expressions like these: 'O Jesus! how good he prays!' 'A'nt that right good, Lord!' 'I can conquer a thousand!' 'Yes,' says another, 'and leap over a wall!' And in short, some burst into laughter, others into crying, some hurra'd, and others groaned. Deafened and confused with their clamour, and shocked at their *worship*, I soon left them."

Of "The Christians," that rapidly spreading portion of the American Unitarians, many interesting facts are given, especially, that of all their preachers having emancipated their slaves; one individual, by this measure of righteousness, reducing himself from a condition of luxury to a state of comparative penury. In the Western States, the number of "the Christians" is computed to be between 15,000 and 20,000. Mr. Thomas thus sums up respecting them:

"As to their religious character, I was never among more practical Christians in my life. Family worship I have never known them to omit, either at night or morning; neither have I ever witnessed over-wrought enthusiasm or extravagance in their public or private services. I often attended their meetings, in different States, and I never witnessed the least disorder or impropriety in any of their meetings. Their preachers, though many of them are of the labouring class of the community, are men of strong minds and good talents; there are also among them many classically educated men. They resemble the Methodists in their mode of sending out preachers, and holding their annual associations. Letters are sent from each conference to the other conferences, and are read at the annual meetings; so that each conference is acquainted with the success of all the others. In one of these letters addressed from 'the elders and brethren of the Christian Conference on the Wabash,' they say, 'it has been determined not to fellowship any person, as a church member, or as a preacher, who is in the spirit or practice of slavery.' 'We feel as much attached to the Bible as a rule of faith and government, as we ever did, and feel determined, God being our helper, to give it precedence of all the books in the world.' In this letter they speak of their ministers under three classes—elders, licensed preachers, and exhorters. The Christians are very nume-

rous in Alabama and Tennessee; also in the vicinity of Georgetown (Kentucky). A large body of them reside on Ellison Prairie (Illinois); also at Bloomington and Indianopolis (Indiana); at Paoli (Indiana) and Paris (Preble county, Ohio). These places are among the principal settlements, of which I have named but a few. I will close with the single remark, that I was never among any class of Christians, who better live up to their profession, than the Western Unitarian Christians."

From Dr. Tuckerman's Reports, we can only give two passages. They involve subjects deeply affecting the improvement and happiness of human society.

"On the second day of my mission, I visited a widow, who was passing rapidly to the grave in consumption; and I ministered to her till the 27th ultimo, on which day she died. She was thirty-five years of age, and had three children. I particularize her, only because I have the pleasure to tell you, that neither in my reading, nor in my ministry of twenty-five years, have I met with a more impressive example of the power, which the simplest principles of our religion, when they have full possession of the heart, may exert in forming a perfectly Christian character. Her daily sufferings were very great. But the ruling principle in her soul was—*love to God*. This was the source of all her immediate comfort, and of all her hope as a disciple of Christ. 'O Sir,' she had repeatedly said to me, 'I would not exchange my sick bed, with the love of God which I feel in my heart, for ten thousand worlds.' 'I can glorify God in my greatest sufferings, for my love of him triumphs over all my distresses.' 'Adversity,' she said, 'is better than prosperity. I once lived without God; but I have passed through many scenes of trouble, and in trouble I learned to know and to love God. The hardest trial to which I have been called, has been, to give up my children. But now that I have given them up to God, I look upon them without a feeling of anxiety." Such, indeed, were her conceptions of God's government, and of the purposes of suffering; such her love of God, and her desire to possess and to maintain the spirit of Christ, that she refused opiates by which her sufferings might have been alleviated; preferring to endure distress, rather than have her mind in the smallest degree enfeebled in its exercises, or checked in its aspirations after a nearer acquaintance with Him, who was the rock of her confidence, and the fountain to her heart of unutterable blessedness. In all my visits to this poor, but intelligent, most amiable, and pious woman, I never heard from her any of the technical language of a sectarian. We were soon friends; and I shall never forget the emotion with which, a short time before she expired, she said, 'I bless God, who has sent you to me, to enlighten my way through the dark valley of the shadow of death.' If no other circumstance, to cheer and strengthen me, should occur in the year of service on which I have entered, than the privilege of ministering to this poor widow, I shall be well compensated for all the toils to which it may call me."

"Let me say a word of the moral exposures of the poor, for they

are indeed hardly to be conceived but by those who are intimately acquainted with the poor. We must go into the rooms in which they live, and see how they live, and what they suffer there, to feel as we should feel for them, and to realize the extent and the strength of their claims upon us. Take the case of a mother, whose intemperate husband is daily spending his small earnings to obtain the rum which he drinks daily; who is herself working like a slave, when she can get work, to procure bread for her children; whose ragged children are not only every day so treated by their father, that they lose, as far as children can lose, all affection for him, but who are at once the daily witnesses of his profaneness and degradation, and who are even daily encouraged by him to disobey their mother; I say, what are you to look for in these children, but that they will be as vicious and debased as their father? I can take you from house to house into families of this description. Or, suppose the case of an intemperate mother, or where both parents are intemperate. Rum is here the chief ingredient of breakfast, of dinner, and of supper. Is it wonderful, then, that there should be not a few among us, who are drunkards at the age of 14 or 15 years? Or, does it excite any surprise, that children who are reared under such influences, *will not* go to school? At 9 or 10 years of age they are wholly beyond parental control. Their *home* is in the streets; and they go to the habitations of their parents, only to obtain a supply of the wants which they cannot supply elsewhere. It is a matter of course, therefore, that they should not only be intemperate, but profane, deceitful, and dishonest. No plan could be devised for their moral ruin, more certain in its results, than the very manner in which they are now living. Will any one say, that this is a necessary evil? I cannot think so. The obligation is most solemn upon those to whom God has given the means of rescuing these young immortals from perdition, to attempt at least what may be attempted for their rescue. These children are now in a regular course of training for the House of Correction, and for the State Prison. My heart has ached to see a mother, and to hear her sobs of anguish, at the House of Correction, while she was visiting her son there, who was only 14 years old; and to see this boy, after weeping for a few moments with his agonized mother, return to be a companion of convicts, with five or six of whom he must be shut up at night in a cell, where he may learn more of the mysteries of iniquity in eight nights, than he would acquire in as many years by his own unaided experience."

In the course of the Report, the Committee of the Association state,

"It is pleasant to be able to express our congratulations at this time with our distant brethren. In Augusta (Georgia), a church was, a few weeks since, dedicated to the worship of One God, even the Father. In Baltimore, a pastor has been happily ordained, who will watch over the flock of the Lord Jesus, that have so long been without an earthly shepherd. In Philadelphia,

the Unitarian Society has so increased, that the erection of a new church has become necessary, and has been commenced. In New York, a minister has been invited to take charge of the Second Congregational Church, whose labours, we have every reason to believe, will be abundantly prospered. In this city [Boston], also, Unitarian Christianity retains its strength. A new Society has recently been gathered; and the former churches, which embrace the doctrines signified by this name, were never more firm in their adherence to the great principles of Christianity, nor more prosperous in their condition."

We sincerely congratulate, not our American brethren alone, but all who value man's happiness and God's glory, on the bright prospects which are opening for the progress of truth. Union and perseverance, gratitude to the all-gracious Father for his mercies, and practical proofs in our lives and conversations, that we deeply prize the blessings of salvation, will, through God's goodness, ensure the further prevalence of the kingdom of Christ—synonymous as that is, with all that is valuable to humanity, all that is honourable to the Almighty.

Unitarian Mission.

THE Rev. Robert Aspland, of Hackney, deputed by the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, has lately made a visit to the Unitarians of Lancashire and Cheshire, with a view to make more generally and fully known the objects of the Association, as well as to augment its funds. He preached in Liverpool and Chester; in Manchester, at the Cross-Street Chapel, the Mosley-Street Chapel, and the Green Gate Meeting-house; he preached also at Bolton, Duckenfield, Chowbent, and Hyde. The pecuniary assistance obtained for the Institution, is considerable; but the good which he has effected must be measured not merely by the increase of the Society's funds, but also, and chiefly, by the interest which has been awakened in favour of its objects; and the cordial and brotherly feelings which the private intercourse, and the piety and zeal which the public services of Mr. Aspland, have contributed to arouse and sustain. We heartily approve of this method of promoting the interests of the Association; and hope, that the success of the first attempt, will induce the Committee to send its advocates into other parts of the country.

WE are happy in being able to inform our readers, that the Rev. H. Montgomery has accepted an invitation to preach at the approaching anniversary of the Unitarian Meeting-house Green Gate, Salford. The anniversary will be held on Sunday and Monday, the 28th and 29th of December next. The hands of Mr. Montgomery will, we doubt not, be strengthened by a visit to our zealous friends in Manchester, and we feel persuaded, that he will return to the contest against spiritual wickedness in high places, in his native country, with refreshed and invigorated spirits.

THE

CHRISTIAN PIONEER.

No. 29. JANUARY, 1829. Vol. III.

Dialogues on Religion.—No. 1.

[WE have pleasure in inserting the following Article. It has already appeared in "The Christian Moderator," Vol. II. p. 535,* but as it forms a portion of a series of conversations, hereafter to be given in our pages, we feel obliged by its communication, and gladly announce, that other Articles by its respected, and excellent Author, are also promised.—*Edit.*]

A. I am sorry to find that you have withdrawn from our place of worship. Had you any cause of offence?

T. Not at all; I had no fault to find either with minister or people. This step was the result of an inquiry into the merits of the Arian and Trinitarian Creeds.

A. Were these or any other controverted points introduced into our devotional service?

T. No: My objection was rather founded on the reverse of this.

A. You wished to hear controversial prayers?

T. I wished for the introduction of sentiments to which I was particularly attached.

A. Now, I should rather think that it would be a profanation of prayer to address the Deity in language of Polemical Divinity, instead of Scripture, in which Trinity, Essence, and the other words necessary to express that doctrine, are not to be found; particularly in invocations, &c.

* This well conducted publication, is, we understand, unfortunately relinquished. We say unfortunately, for we cannot afford to lose any means of spreading abroad the principles of scriptural inquiry—unfortunately, as it is an additional proof of the supineness of those who are called "liberal Christians," in embracing these opportunities of doing good; and of their indifference to the efforts of those who are labouring in the diffusion of truths they acknowledge to be worthy of all acceptation. It is not "The Christian Moderator" alone, which has cause of complaint,—for we much question, if any one of our periodicals is supported with that earnestness and zeal, which might have been expected from the intelligence, the learning, and the worldly prosperity of the members of the denomination, to the promotion of whose cause they are chiefly devoted.—*Edit.*

descriptive of his nature. Was there any thing in our devotions to which you could object, or in which you could not join? Or was there any assent, consent, or subscription required of you, or any scrutiny made into your private opinions?

T. I cannot say that there was; but I think it wrong to countenance, or worship with a people of different sentiments from my own.

A. I fear, then, you would neither have countenanced nor worshipped with the Apostles, who certainly never prayed to a Triune God. Is there nothing in the worship on which you now attend, discordant from your feelings or belief?

T. No doubt, there must be always somewhat of this kind, but not with respect to the Trinity.

A. With respect to the Trinity, do you think that all your fellow-worshippers are of the same mind?

T. We all agree in the doctrine.

A. Do you all coincide in the interpretation of the doctrine?

T. I suppose this is not to be expected.

A. Then you are still worshipping with a people of a different opinion from your own.

T. Yes, in minute distinctions, but not on the object of worship.

A. I presume you are aware that the differences among nominal Trinitarians, are neither minute nor unimportant; for instance, between Tritheists and Sabellians.

T. I am well aware of that. One extreme is the height of impiety; and the other is no Trinity at all.

A. The shades between these are innumerable; and probably both they and the extremes exist in every numerous congregation of Trinitarians. You are, therefore, farther from uniformity than before. Pray, what is your own scheme?

T. I am not prepared to give a categorical answer to that question. It is a mystery, and cannot be clearly explained by any one.

A. You know, however, that many divines have undertaken to explain it. To which of these do you adhere?

T. I do not attach myself to any private doctor.

A. You are right in that; for none of them ever broached a scheme, but he was presently confuted by another Trinitarian; from Sherlock, who was condemned by the Uni-

versity of Oxford, to Clarke, who was prosecuted by the Convocation.

T. Oh, his scheme was downright Arianism.

A. So, then, you *have* some distinct opinion on this subject?

T. I may, without being able or willing to explain it to you. But I do not depend on any single divine, but on the authority of all the churches in the world.

A. You can tell, at least, what Being you worship; otherwise you would be chargeable with worshipping an *unknown God*, like the Athenians. We might say to you, as Jesus said to the Samaritans, "Ye worship ye know not what; we know what we worship."

T. I worship one God in three persons.

A. Then you worship three persons; and as they are all eternal and equal in power and glory, you worship three Gods.

T. No; I worship but one God.

A. Why, I suppose you have always done so. This is no new doctrine, nor any cause for deserting your fellow-christians. But do you understand yourself when you say "three persons in one God;" or do you conceive that your minister and his whole congregation understand these words in the same sense, when neither you nor they can tell what you mean?

T. No: I dare say there is some variety of opinion among us.

A. In this case, you, each of you, worship a God of your own creation: at least, you form different notions of this complex Deity; and you adore and pray to different Beings. Now this you might have done in your former place of worship. When your Arian minister addressed Almighty God, you might understand that he is composed of three persons, as you do now; for, I presume, your present minister offers up his prayers to God, Almighty and Everlasting, Merciful and Gracious, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and our Father in heaven. So that each of you is worshipping his own idol in secret, while the minister prays to Jehovah; as Rachel had her little teraphim for private use hid in the stuff.

T. Sir, you are making more free than welcome. I desire that you may be more cautious, or we must break off our conference. I cannot bear to be charged with idolatry. I worship no images.

A. I beg your pardon; I shall be more on my guard. I hoped that I might use the freedom of our former intimacy; but I fear your new opinions have spoiled your temper, as often happens. I assure you no change has taken place in mine. I confess, however, that I was encroaching too much on your feelings in their present state. As to idolatry, it is true, that, by derivation, it signifies the worship of images; but both in Scripture and common use, it implies the worship of false Gods. However, I shall leave this to your own reflections. I shall only say, that there was no danger of either in your former mode of worship. Is this the case with you now?

T. And will you pretend that there is no diversity of sentiment in your society?

A. By no means; a variety of opinions on many points is unavoidable, and not at all inconvenient among men, who mutually recognise the right of private judgment. We profess to think and inquire, each for himself; and we receive the instruction and exhortation of our pastor with respect, because we know that he does so too, and has superior advantages as to education and study. Accordingly, we can converse on controverted points, as on other matters of importance, with perfect amity.

T. Very well; but I refer to worship. Is there not some difference as to the worship due to Christ?

A. Yes. There are some Arians who think that he is entitled to a subordinate mediatorial worship. But this does not at all interfere with the adoration of the Supreme God. You know that we make no scruple to ascribe to the Messiah, blessing, praise, and glory, in our thanksgiving to his Father; but we adhere to his own command, not to ask any thing of him, nor to address ourselves personally to him; but to pray to the Father through him, and in his name.

T. My objections to your services, however, were not confined to the devotional part. I was often hurt by the tenor of the sermons.

A. Was there any thing irreverent, uncharitable, or intolerant in the manner of discussing religious subjects?

T. No. I cannot say that there was: but I could not bear to hear doctrines, in which I believed, uniformly omitted, and often questioned or denied.

A. This must have happened very seldom; for our ministers have always been blamed for abstaining too much

from doctrine, and preaching dry morality: from this complaint, it would appear, that you attend sermons not for instruction, but to be flattered in your errors and confirmed in your prejudices.

T. I do not admit them to be errors, but think them to be sacred truths.

A. No man thinks himself in error, or he would change his mind; and the only way to ascertain this, is to hear both sides. On the same principle, you would read no books, written against your opinions, and condemn those who do, and thus deny them the right of private judgment and free inquiry.

T. By no means. I am as firm a friend to freedom of inquiry as ever, and an enemy to the imposition of creeds and confessions. In fact, it is for exercising it in my own case, that you blame me.

A. You have given it over very soon; and so far you are singularly liberal, allowing it to others, and denying it to yourself. You seem to have adopted the Popish principle. The Church of Rome allows the exercise of private judgment, till the person is convinced of its infallibility, and no further. This is very reasonable; for what use is there in inquiry, after we have found an infallible guide? If we agree with our guide, it is needless: if we differ from him, we err. In like manner, you have formed an infallibility for yourself, and require no more information or guidance. Having become a Pope to yourself, you have exercised another of his prerogatives, by making a list of forbidden books, an index expurgatorius. But I should be glad to know, why you pin your faith on established churches? You know how they were established, and how they are maintained.

T. Yes, I do know that there is too much civil power and worldly policy mixed up with them; but they derive their doctrine from the most ancient times.

A. Not the most ancient or primitive in my mind, for I cannot find it in the New Testament. But let us wave that for the present. You are sensible that Protestants derived it from Popery; that the Church of Rome denies that it is to be found in Scripture; that in these countries it is enacted by the Scotch and British Parliaments; and that, in fact, the whole Common Prayer, &c. are only clauses or riders on the Act of Uniformity.

T. I don't meddle with this, nor do I look entirely to

national churches, but I find the Trinity adopted by independent bodies of great weight and learning.

A. There is too much human authority in this argument; but be so good as to tell me, where you place your chief dependence?

T. I rely on Protestant Synods from the beginning of the Reformation, and on the concurrence of British and Irish Synods of later date.

A. I am afraid you have not considered the circumstances under which the first synods assembled, the remaining dregs of Popery and the influence of the civil power; and as to more recent assemblies, I should be glad to know which of them you take for your guide.

T. They appear to me to agree; for instance, the Orthodox Party, at Salter's Hall, and the Irish Synods of 1726 and 1827, and the general consent of the Foreign Churches.

A. As to the Foreign Churches, you seem to have forgotten the lamentations of the Continental Society, on the woful falling off, throughout Protestant Europe. By their own confession, Arianism has established itself in their citadel, Geneva, the cradle of Orthodoxy, and overrun the academies and the churches of the French Huguenots, with some exceptions; Holland is not much better; and Germany much worse; and we all know what progress it has made in America.

T. Yes, I have heard that a sudden delusion has overspread the Continent; but these islands are surely unanimous.

A. I fear, my good friend, you are under some delusion yourself. You surely are not ignorant, that even within our memories, a numerous body of learned and exemplary men threw up their preferments and all their prospects in the Church, rather than worship God under fictitious titles; that the Unitarians form a considerable part of the Protestants of England; and that thousands of churchmen, both clergy and laity, in England and Scotland, concur with them in opinion. Even in Ireland the tocsin has been lately rung.

T. You have said nothing, however, of the English and Irish Synods.

A. I thank you for reminding me of them. I think you mentioned the meeting at Salter's Hall. This was rather inadvertent, for the only question at issue was car-

ried against the Trinitarians, and even they did not venture to descend to particulars, as knowing well that there were many discordant opinions among themselves; but to accommodate all parties as well as they could, they divided the matter between an answer in the Scotch Catechism, and an article in the English Liturgy.

T. You have no right to suppose that they felt any such difficulty.

A. I may be mistaken, but I am led to think so from the conduct of the other two synods that you appealed to. In that of 1726, they only asserted the supreme or essential Deity of the Son of God; in that of 1827, the most learned and orthodox members could not agree upon any mode of expressing their belief, even on this proposition; and, at last, settled the dispute by adopting the words of the Westminster Confession.

T. But they all concurred in the doctrine.

A. In what doctrine, my dear Sir?

T. In the Trinity, the Essential Divinity and Coequality of the Son.

A. Is this what you call a Trinity? It is only a Duality. Trinity is Triunity, three in one. The Third Person has long been left out of the account; and were there not 30,000 ministers in the United Kingdom paid for ringing his name in the ears of the people every Sunday and holiday, he would have been forgotten in this controversy long ago. Divines find they have quite enough to do to support two Gods, without embarrassing themselves with a third.

T. You make very free with divine subjects; but say what you will, I must prefer the creeds of all the churches, to your effusions.

A. What creeds do you mean? I suppose the Apostles', the Nicene, and the Athanasian. Which do you prefer?

T. The Apostles', undoubtedly, as being either composed by them, or in their times; and, at all events, as possessing the greatest antiquity, and being universally received.

A. If you said this on due consideration, there would be no difference between us; for it is a Unitarian Creed; and might indeed, with very little latitude of interpretation, serve as a bond of union among us all. Accordingly, all parties, I believe, teach it to their children. It would be very happy if they taught them no more.

T. You are getting on very fast; but you must not expect me to follow you at this rate. Does it not declare a belief in the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost explicitly?

A. Certainly: and in the Holy Catholic Church, the Communion of Saints, and so on. Are these also Divine Persons? All Christians agree in these articles. But it speaks of the Divine Persons as perfectly distinct, it makes mention of no Trinity, no union of Essence, no co-equality. It is, therefore, very prudently ordered in the Rubric for the morning service, that it "shall not be read on the same day with the Athanasian Creed." The contradiction would be too glaring. Do you consider this last as your standard?

T. The Athanasian? God forbid! But the Nicene is a medium between them, and therefore best calculated for general adoption.

A. Why, now, my good friend, we are nearly agreed again; for, as the Apostles' has been called the Unitarian or Socinian Creed, so the Nicene has been thought to incline to Arianism, though purposely framed in opposition to Arius. We admit, that the word God, is predicated of the Son in Scripture; but we do not clearly understand "Very God of very God, Light of Light, &c."; nor have we met with any who could explain these terms. Many Arians worship the Son, but none the Holy Ghost, I believe. In other respects, we agree pretty well with this Creed; for there is not a word in it of Trinity, Co-essentiality, or three Persons in one God. It is, as you say, the medium between two extremes, as the Arian doctrine is.

T. Well, Sir, have you done?

A. Indulge me with one observation more. It will not hurt your feelings, as, I believe, you have no intention of joining the Episcopal Church. You have seen what a jumble of creeds are here; all, on different principles, all making part of the Common Prayer. There are other contradictions in them with which I shall not trouble you. You have seen, that in the Apostles' Creed, there is no trace of a Trinity, no divine attribute, or title attributed to Jesus Christ or the Holy Ghost; and yet in the Catechism, immediately after repeating it, the child is asked, "What do you *chiefly* learn in these articles of thy belief?" The answer is, "I learn to believe in God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost." This is monstrous. There is no name too bad for it.

T. It does, indeed, appear to be a gross imposition on the poor children; and one that could hardly be submitted to by any others; and yet, I believe, it must be repeated by grown persons at confirmation.

A. From the great stress you lay on Creeds, Synods, and established churches, I fear, my friend, that you are in danger of falling into implicit faith. Have you met with Campbell's Philosophy of Rhetoric?

T. Oh yes, and read it with great pleasure; but I cannot conceive what connection Rhetoric can have with the Trinity.

A. Why, the mention of implicit faith, brought it into my mind; and then I recollected another point more remotely related to our subject. There is a chapter in it, that explains, how men may and do talk and write without ideas, or even a glimpse of meaning. Now, I suspect, you will be often reminded of this in your new connection. You will meet with preachers, who have a wonderful talent of this kind, who, with an enviable fluency and even choice of words, will deal out the most florid, splendid, and even pathetic nonsense, to the admiration of a crowd, who all the while think they are edified, and are certainly charmed and moved by this display of unmeaning verbosity. But the principal point that struck my fancy, was the story by which he illustrates implicit faith. Do you recollect it?

T. Very indistinctly. I should like to hear it again.

A. I am not sure that I have it correctly; but I will give you the substance.

A man was asked, what he believed about the Trinity. Now obseve, how well his answers agree with yours. He believed what the church believed; as you do. And what does the church believe? It believed what he believed. He could give no better explanation than you. The interrogator thought, he would catch him, by asking what did he and the church believe? But he was prepared for that too, and replied we both believe the same thing! which, I think, was the sum and substance of what I got from you.

T. A very good story; but, as I recollect, there was not a word about the Trinity in Dr. Campbell.

A. Well, may be so. The Doctor chose to put it upon a Roman Catholic: but it would have fitted his own church and many others just as well.

T. I am not fond of treating grave subjects in this ludicrous way. It appears to me profane.

A. I am of the same opinion, and hope, that I have not so far transgressed. But I sometimes prefer a light and cheerful manner, *incolumi gravitate*, to the horrid moroseness, by which religious conversation and argument are often disfigured. It guards against angry disputation at the time; and does not leave such a festering wound. Besides, *ridentem dicere verum*, you know, *quid vetat?* and then, *omne tulit punctum*, you remember, *qui miscuit utile dulci:* and then comes, *ridiculum acri*, &c. I could give it to you in Greek; but you might think me pedantic.

T. As for your Greek, I am sure you could hardly find it in the New Testament. You are more indebted to Horace than Scripture, for your authorities. The wisest of men differed from you both: "I said of laughter, it is mad; and of mirth, what doeth it?" "As the crackling of thorns under a pot, so is the laughter of a fool;" noisy, sparkling, and worthless. St. Paul, too, cautions us against "foolish talking and jesting, which are not convenient;" which you know is a figure of speech, for extremely inconvenient and improper. I suspect that your jocularity is only irony and sarcasm in disguise; and as for your sweets, they taste like the gall of bitterness to me.

A. I am sorry you have so bad an opinion of me; and that I have given you any pain. I assure you, that though I may have lost some of my respect for your understanding, I feel no abatement of esteem for your character, or affection for your person; and you may depend on my avoiding in future, every topic that can hurt your feelings.

T. I request you may. For the present, however, I wish to put an end to this perplexing conversation. I have taken some pains to make up my mind, and do not wish to be again unsettled.

A. My dear friend, with great deference, I think you should have thought of that before your late change. You are now far advanced in years, and of a valetudinary habit. In such cases it is very imprudent to involve ourselves in intricate controversies. We should rather abide by convictions deliberately formed, while our health was sound and our faculties entire, capable of investigating difficult subjects; and when, if we err, we have time and strength to correct our errors and retrieve our slips. When our first opinions are plain, rational, and safe, we should be on our guard against the interference of artful or enthusiastic people.

T. Whatever I might or should have done, I should now appear very ridiculous were I to change again. I should be pointed at, both for my versatility and my Arian principles.

A. Ay. This remark throws new light on the subject. Arianism, like Christianity in primitive times, is a *Sect every where spoken against.* The same feeling would have made you shun the Apostles. It would lead one to be ashamed of Protestantism in France, and conform to Popery in Portugal, Spain, and Italy. But I beg your pardon for mentioning this. I should be sorry to suspect you of that meanness in any degree. But I am detaining you too long. The next time we meet, our intercourse will be more agreeable; and I shall hope to hear an account of your progress, and how you like your new acquaintances. —Give me your hand and farewell.

To the Editor of the Christian Pioneer.

London, *Dec.* 4, 1828.

Sir,

Dr. Parr in one of his letters lately published, (Works, vol. VII. p. 136,) remarks, that "Priests, like Kings, never forget or forgive." From the length of the controversy between Dr. Wardlaw and myself, and from the personal aspect, which it has now assumed, our readers may be disposed to conclude, that the observation applies not only to the members of proud and splendid hierarchies, but also to the humble ministers of the conventicle. I can however testify with regard to myself, that, while I have judged it necessary to vindicate my own character from a most groundless and unjust accusation, and have thought that that accusation debarred me from all friendly intercourse with him who preferred it, yet I have been uniformly disposed to conciliation; and I have observed with pleasure, that my opponent, both in the Preface to his 4th Edition, and in his recent communication to your pages, not only writes with greater moderation, but expressly says, *that he was far from meaning any extension of his charge to a general one against my moral reputation as an honest man.* (Christian Pioneer, vol. III. p. 99.) Now, although I cannot consider this admission on the part of Dr. Wardlaw as making full amends for the

wrong which he has done me, and am at a loss to perceive the consistency of asserting, that I may be a man of real integrity, and yet that I am capable of "wilful and deliberate misrepresentation," whenever a tempting occasion offers, or a sufficiently strong inducement allures me to the crime, I am nevertheless willing to accept Dr. Wardlaw's apology, and I hereby express my wish, that every thing personal or offensive between us could be expunged from what we have written. In particular I regret, that I should have used language so like that of recrimination as the passage, which Dr. Wardlaw quotes from the Advertisement to the Second Edition of my "Sequel." It is true, that *at that time* I felt persuaded, that Dr. Wardlaw did not believe in the truth of the charge, which he had six years before preferred against me. To express this feeling was not however *giving him the lie*, as he calls it. My conviction was principally grounded upon Dr. Wardlaw's apparently polite and friendly behaviour, when he accidentally met me in the streets of Glasgow a few weeks before that Advertisement was written. My reflections were, "How is it, that Dr. W. with the mean opinion, which he has expressed, of my character in regard to veracity, can offer me his right hand, and meet me with the testimonies of respect? He may have altered his opinion, and no longer think, that my alleged misrepresentation of his doctrine was 'wilful and deliberate.' If so, he may esteem me as I wish to esteem him. But, as his charge was *publicly preferred*, it ought to be *publicly retracted*. Until he shows himself willing not merely to renew towards me the expressions of respect in private, but to make some public acknowledgment of the incorrectness of his language, it is impossible for me to return his civilities, or to behave towards him as I always did before his accusation was made." It was under the impression of these views and feelings, Sir, that I wrote the Advertisement to the Second Edition of my "Sequel." It appears however, that my impression at that time repecting Dr. Wardlaw's change of opinion was erroneous; for to the present hour he persists in his charge of "wilful and deliberate misrepresentation," although he now says, that he was far from intending that charge to affect my general reputation as an honest man.

Having made these concessions, and having expressed my willingness to accept Dr. Wardlaw's admission as an

apology for his former obnoxious language, I shall now proceed to make some remarks upon the defence of that language, which he has advanced in the same paper. I have brought before your readers the fact, that, in treating of the doctrine of the hypostatic union, I had presented, first, a statement of that doctrine, and then a refutation of it; that Dr. Wardlaw had never offered the slightest objection to my statement, which was indeed partly couched in his own language; that he had noticed only the refutation founded upon that statement; that he had represented this refutation as being my statement of the doctrine, and that in reference to it he had charged me with exhibiting a hideous caricature, the product of my own malicious fancy, in which I had misrepresented the doctrine wilfully and deliberately. The amount of what Dr. Wardlaw now advances in vindication of himself is, that in bringing my refutation I introduced a statement of the doctrine different from that which I had given just before, and that this additional statement, introduced in the course of my argument, is contained in the following short and subordinate member of a sentence, "*to maintain that the same mind is endued with a divine and human nature.*" It appears, then, that I have given, first, a true, and soon after a false statement of the Trinitarian doctrine. Let this for a moment be granted. If Dr. Wardlaw thought it necessary to vent against me the language of severe censure and vituperation on account of the *false* statement, he ought also to have allowed me credit for honesty and ingenuousness in giving the *true* statement just before, and in giving it far more fully and prominently, and partly in his own words, and he ought not to have left his readers to infer, that the false statement was the only account which I had given of the doctrine at all. Indeed, Sir, it appears to me, that in explaining his charge as referring to this small clause, Dr. Wardlaw has come to a "most lame and impotent conclusion." I need only appeal to the common sense of your readers to perceive, that, if I first gave a full and clear statement of the doctrine, to which no objection has ever been made, and which was expressed partly in the very words of my opponent, no implied statement, which I might afterwards introduce in the course of my argument, could be a "wilful and deliberate misrepresentation." I could not be such a blockhead as to endeavour to "blind my readers" by contradicting myself.

Supposing also that the clause, "*to maintain that the same mind,*" *&c.* is not a correct representation of the Trinitarian doctrine, does it follow, that the misrepresentation was wilful, that it was deliberate? Can the politeness of a gentleman, can the candour and meekness of a Christian find no other supposable source of mistake? Is the doctrine of the hypostatic union so clear and simple, are the human faculties so free from liability to misconception, that only the spirit of falsehood could induce a man to give an erroneous account of it? Have then the *defenders* of this doctrine always maintained the same language respecting it? In contending for it have they always understood for what they were contending? Was it in the first ages of the Church conceived to be so plain a matter and so plainly laid down in Sacred Scripture, that explications of it were superfluous, or was it not deemed necessary by the heads of the Church to call four successive General Councils in order to determine what the doctrine was, and is it not on the authority of these four General Councils, that orthodox Trinitarians have ever since asserted the Divine and human natures to subsist in one person, ασυγχυτως, ατρεπτως, αδιαιρετως, αχωριστως? Is not ecclesiastical history filled with the accounts of the angry disputes and fierce persecutions which have arisen among Trinitarians themselves from misconceptions of this their favourite doctrine? If therefore it should be incorrectly represented either by a professed Trinitarian, or, *a fortiori*, by an Anti-trinitarian, should not the mis-statement be attributed to ignorance, to carelessness, to the want of candour and patience, of diligence and discernment, rather than to the want of veracity, and to the spirit of wilful malignity and falsehood?

I flatter myself, Sir, that your candid and intelligent readers, including those of orthodox sentiments, will by this time be convinced, that, if my statement of their doctrine in the words quoted by Dr. Wardlaw was incorrect, the misrepresentation was not however deliberate or wilful? I shall now avail myself of their indulgence and of yours, and also of the explanations contained in Dr. Wardlaw's letter, to endeavour to convince them, that I have not even been chargeable with inaccuracy in my representations. For this purpose I beg to remind them, that in the course of the controversy with Dr. Wardlaw I sometimes thought it necessary to argue in two different ways upon the same

point of doctrine, or, in other words, in refuting the same proposition. One method of arguing was necessary, supposing the terms of the proposition to be *intelligible;* another was demanded, supposing them to be *unintelligible.* The reader will find, that I have insisted upon this distinction in my Vindication of Unitarianism, Part I. chap. iv. Part III. chap. i. and in the corresponding chapters of the Sequel. It is no less expressly brought forward in the Vindication, Part III. chap. iv., the very portion of my work, to which Dr. Wardlaw's charge of misrepresentation refers. I have in this passage both stated the doctrine of the hypostatic union and endeavoured to refute it, *supposing it intelligible,* and I have afterwards in p. 159 treated of the doctrine, *supposing it unintelligible.* In the corresponding chapter of the Sequel I have again referred to the same distinction, and have explained my former observations as founded upon it. In this particular case, therefore, I assume that the word *person,* as employed by Dr. Wardlaw in propounding the doctrine of the hypostatic union, is used either with a meaning, or without a meaning. First, I say, let it be used *with a meaning;* such and such consequences follow: Secondly, let it be used *without a meaning;* a different view of the subject becomes necessary. Under the first case, that is, supposing the word *person* to have a meaning, I attributed to it the only sense, in which I have found it to be employed by Dr. Wardlaw, *viz.* as equivalent to *Intelligent Being,* or *Mind.* Also in various other parts of this controversy I have used the expressions *Mind, Intelligent Being, Intelligent Agent,* and *Person,* as equivalent and convertible; nor has Dr. W. attempted to prove, that this use of the terms was incorrect, and indeed in so employing them I only submitted to his previous authority; for in his Discourses, (No. ix. p. 281–286, 1st Ed.) he uses *Mind, Person,* and *Intelligent Agent,* as synonymous expressions.

I now learn for the first time from Dr. Wardlaw's letter addressed to you, that his charge is wholly grounded upon the introduction in the course of my argument of the before-mentioned subordinate clause, and upon the use of a single term in that clause, *viz.* the term *Mind.* My answer then is, that in that part of the chapter I was arguing upon the supposition that the term *Person,* as employed in propounding the doctrine of the hypostatic union,

has a meaning; that I took it in the only sense, which, so far as I know, has ever been attributed to it in reference to this subject, and in the only sense, in which I find the term employed by Dr. Wardlaw; that I consequently regarded *Person*, *Intelligent Agent*, and *Mind* as synonymous expressions, and used indifferently either the one or the other. Dr. Wardlaw in his recent communication to you, referring to my substitution of MIND for *Person*, says that I have given a statement of the Trinitarian doctrine, "which admitted more readily of being branded with the imputation of contradictory absurdity." To me it appears, that, supposing the word *Person* to have a meaning, and to be identical in its signification with *Mind*, the absurdity is exactly the same, whether we say, "The same *Person* is endued both with a divine and human nature," or "The same *Mind* is endued both with a divine and human nature." The word *Mind* however appears to me to be less ambiguous and more generally understood than the word *Person*, and hence I conceive that a fair reasoner will be disposed to employ it as at least equally eligible with the other. In the present instance the use of it does perhaps render the absurdity of the orthodox doctrine more glaring, because, as the term *Person* has been used by Trinitarians in many different ways, and as the advocates of orthodoxy, including Dr. Wardlaw, are always ready to avail themselves of its ambiguity so as to elude exposure and defeat by changing their position, it is not very easy for the reader to keep the meaning of the term steadily in view during the course of the argument. If however the reader can by an effort of the mind succeed in doing this, I maintain that the doctrine will appear equally irrational and self-contradictory, whether *Person* or *Mind* is the word employed. To illustrate this I will quote a statement of the doctrine from one of its most learned and celebrated patrons, and from a book of the highest authority, which in the University of Oxford is commonly given to be studied by young men in order to imbue their tender minds with just notions of religion. The treatise referred to is Bishop Pearson's Exposition of the Creed (p. 186, 7th Ed.) where we read as follows:

"That person, which was begotten of the Father before all worlds, and so was really the Lord of Glory and most truly God, took upon him the nature of man and in that nature, being still the same person, which before he was,

did suffer. When our Saviour fasted forty days, there was no other person hungry than that Son of God which made the world; when he sat down weary by the well, there was no other person felt that thirst but he which was eternally begotten of the Father, the fountain of the Deity; when he was buffeted and scourged, there was no other person sensible of those pains than that eternal Word, which before all worlds was impassible; when he was crucified and died, there was no other person which gave up the ghost, but the son of Him, and so of the same nature with Him, who only hath immortality."

Let Dr. Wardlaw or any other of your readers, in perusing this passage, suppose by way of experiment, that the term *Person* has a meaning, and that it means *a Mind*, or *an Intelligent Being*, and let him say, whether by substituting *Mind* for *Person* I have made the doctrine appear more self-contradictory than it appears in the statement of Bishop Pearson.

But perhaps Dr. Wardlaw will say, that, when he affirms Jesus Christ to be one person, though possessed of two opposite natures, he uses the word "*person*" *without a meaning*. Well, I have provided for this case also. In p. 159 of my Vindication I have said, "The doctrine then becomes like sounding brass or as a tinkling cymbal;" and I have observed, that in this case we may give our assent to the doctrine, abiding by the very terms, in which we find it propounded by divine authority, but not otherwise.

In the chapter of my Sequel, which relates to this part of the controversy, I have asked (p. 88), "Does Mr. Wardlaw believe, that the *one person* of Christ includes *more* MINDS *than one*"? To this question I have not yet received an answer so direct and explicit as I could wish. Nevertheless, in his recent communication to your pages, Dr. W. employs the following language: "Mr. Yates represents them [Trinitarians] as maintaining that 'the *same mind* is endued with a divine and a human nature;'—as if, in the assumption of the human nature, the *divine mind* and the *human mind* had become *one and the same mind*, possessed of the opposite and contradictory properties of the finite and the infinite. I called this 'wilful and deliberate misrepresentation;' and I am at a loss to see what else I could have called it." Thus *it appears* (for I speak with diffidence), that Dr. Wardlaw believes Jesus Christ to be *two minds*, though he is but one person. If this be

his opinion, I apprehend, that he has in fact lapsed into the alleged heresy of the Nestorians, which was condemned by the Council of Chalcedon. His language is certainly unusual, and I greatly doubt whether it is orthodox.

Let us for a moment suppose, that he believes in the perfect distinctness not only of the two natures, but also of the two minds, to which those natures respectively belong. We have then to contemplate an eternal and infinite mind, unchangeably possessed of all the attributes of God; we have also to contemplate a mortal and finite mind, distinguished by the qualities of man and united to a human body. These two minds, as well as their two natures, continue perfectly distinct from one another. They have distinct wills,* distinct operations, distinct and opposite properties. They are said to be united in one person. But what is meant by *person?* If *one person* means *one mind*, or *one intelligent agent*, the doctrine is a direct contradiction in terms. If on the other hand the term *person* has no meaning, the doctrine may indeed stand in point of *consistency;* but what becomes of its *orthodoxy?* It implies no more than a Unitarian, or even a Deist may believe. The hypostatic union has always been represented by its advocates as a most sublime and incomprehensible mystery. A preacher, whose fame and popularity in his day were equal to Dr. Wardlaw's in the present, commences his discussion of this subject in the following terms: "The union of two natures of Christ in one and the self-same person is that great wonder which now we must speak as we are able; but alas, how should we speak this union, and not be confounded in ourselves? It is a great mystery, a secret, a wonder; many wonders have been since the beginning of the world, but all the wonders that ever were, must give place to this, and in respect thereof cease to be wonderful.†" But, if the doctrine be such as Dr. Wardlaw seems now to represent it, there is nothing mysterious or wonderful in it. We are told of two distinct minds, a divine and a human, each retaining its peculiar properties. These two minds are said indeed to be united. But to what does this assertion amount? Are not the minds of all intelligent beings in some sense

* To deny them distinct wills would be to fall into the heresy of the Monothelites.

† Looking unto Jesus, by Isaac Ambrose, Book iv. chap. i. § 5.

united to God? Are not all created things *united* into one system? May not the mind of every prophet or inspired person be said to be in a more especial manner *united* to the Divine mind? Dr. Wardlaw chooses to employ in reference to this union a set of scholastic terms; but, if he attaches no clear or intelligible notions to them, he may in fact believe no more than we do, and his orthodoxy may after all be nothing more than "Unitarianism in a mist."

In my "Sequel" (p. 73) I complained of the "strange confusion" of a part of Dr. Wardlaw's language upon this subject. But, as the question now stands, we have "confusion worse confounded." In order to be extricated from it, I beg leave through your pages to ask from him an answer to the following simple questions:

1. *Does Dr. Wardlaw, in reference to the doctrine of the hypostatic union, use the term* PERSON *with a meaning, or without a meaning?*

2. *If he uses it with a meaning, what is that meaning?*

3. *Does he believe that there are in the God-man Jesus Christ two distinct* MINDS *as well as two distinct* NATURES?

4. *Can he show, that any other authors of acknowledged orthodoxy have maintained the same doctrine in the same language?*

Awaiting a reply to these interesting questions,

I remain, SIR, yours respectfully,

JAMES YATES.

Reflections on the Principles and Evidences of Christianity.

LETTER III.

On the Resurrection and Translation of Jesus as proved at his Sepulchre.

I HAVE observed that the circumstances which are related concerning the resurrection of Jesus, are a representation, not merely of the revival of a dead person to ordinary vitality, but also of his translation to an immortal existence. Few, indeed, can imagine, that on his ascension, he retained the same gross animal body; it must now, at least, have undergone a change to a state in which it was incorruptible, as well as removed from the ordinary cognizance of mortals. But, by considering the circumstances just alluded to, it will, I am persuaded, appear, that he

underwent this great change at the instant of his resurrection, and that his subsequent appearances in the ordinary state of humanity, were only occasional, like those of the angels at his sepulchre, or of Moses and Elijah, at his transfiguration; and had principally in view, to bring home to the conviction of the apostles, and through them, to the world at large, the evidence that he was in his own proper person, in body and mind, both restored to life, and translated to a superior and immortal state of being.

It is no where intimated, that there were any manifestations of Jesus, while he remained in the state of death; on the contrary, it is clearly implied in the phrase, "Thou wilt not suffer thine *Holy One* to see corruption," that his whole person remained inanimate, and could resume its vital functions only by that interposition of the Almighty which raised him from death. But his manifestations subsequent to that event, were materially different from such as would have attended a simple restoration to this mortal state of existence. They were only occasional, while he was usually withdrawn from the observation even of his apostles, though, from the circumstances in which he presented himself, and the conversations which he held with them, it appeared that he was intimately acquainted with what passed among them, and even with the particular state of their minds, previous to his several appearances. And though on all those occasions he gave them abundant proofs of his real and corporeal presence, yet the manner of his presentations and removals, in every instance in which they are related, appear to have been supernatural, and in several instances, clearly proved that he had been, and was again removed from the observation of their senses.

That this invisible state of existence was the result of a resurrection from death, and of a translation of his body from its animal and visible state, appeared in its removal from the sepulchre in a manner which eluded the vigilance of the watchmen.* It was in consequence of his having predicted the occurrence of the first of these events, at the time when it is related to have taken place, that they were posted at its entrance to prevent the removal of the body. They would now, therefore, be watching with their utmost vigilance to secure their charge, and its ap-

* See Matt. xxviii. 2, 3, and 11, &c.

pearance from the place where it was deposited, whether living or inanimate, would have been the most prominent object to have arrested their attention. Had they seen it in either of these states, it would have been incumbent on them to have related the facts with precision to their employers, who would not easily acquiesce in any representation of their ignorance on a point so material, and apparently easy to be determined. Could they have ascertained that it had been removed in a state of inanimation, though by means which they had been unable to prevent, this would have furnished such a strong presumption against the reality of his resurrection, as would have overruled almost any evidence on the contrary side. How *desirous* both they and their employers were of being enabled to set forth such a representation, appeared in their abortive attempt to give evidence of what passed while their senses were steeped in slumbers. Could they have alleged convincing proofs that they had beheld the living person of Jesus stepping forth from his sepulchre, with all the dignity and majesty, which in that case might have been expected, this would clearly have acquitted them of their charge, and would have appeared more satisfactory, and less far-fetched and incredible than that which is related. But, upon the only topic on which information was to be expected from them, they appear to have had nothing to communicate, except that the body had disappeared; while they relate other particulars of a most extraordinary description, which no one could have anticipated. They represent that an unknown personage had appeared, of such power as to overrule all their martial energies, rolling away the immense stone which secured the body in the sepulchre, and by his awful form and aspect alone, inspiring them with a death-like tremor.

In this representation, two opposite species of miracles appear to be included: both of which must have been remote from the conceptions of those from whom it originated. Their minds must, at the time, have been engrossed with ideas relative to the body or person of Jesus. Any attempts from without to effect its release, they must have resolved to oppose at the hazard of their lives; their military character being staked in its prevention. If they had any boding apprehensions, they must have been of Jesus from within, who, without any mention of exterior

assistance, had predicted, that "on the third day, he would rise again;" and as they had been instrumental in fulfilling his predictions concerning his death to the very letter, they could hardly feel free from all apprehensions of his resurrection. Between their determined resolution, therefore, to withstand any outward attempts upon the sepulchre, on the part of his disciples, and the apprehensions of his personal appearance, their thoughts must have been fully occupied. Any attempts from without, would summon forth their utmost energies, and would operate to release them from apprehensions from within; as a clandestine attack for the purpose of effecting the removal of the body, would convince them that Jesus was a deceiver, and his agents endeavouring to carry on the fraud. On the other hand, any movement from within, would awaken all their apprehensions, and would so strongly imprint, amid the darkness and silence of night, the dreaded form of the risen Jesus upon their imaginations, that it could with difficulty be distinguished from reality. The event reverses their feelings and anticipations in both respects; they perceive and are alarmed by nothing from within; while from without, a power arrives which appals their firmest resolutions, overrules all their military strength, and eludes the utmost vigilance of their senses, or even the liveliest bodings of their imaginations, with regard to the appearance of the body, or the mode of its disappearance. From without, they anticipated nothing but an attack from the disciples, which they were fully able and firmly resolved to withstand, and which would tend greatly to promote their courage, as it would release them from all apprehensions from within; their whole solicitude was bent on retaining the body, and their sole apprehensions centred on its return to life by one of those acts of miraculous power which he had in so many instances exercised upon others. With these ideas their minds must have been occupied; the appearance of a personage which in both respects affected them totally contrary to their anticipations, therefore, could only have been the effect of reality. If their senses were before in any degree dulled by a tendency to sleep, every faculty must have been thoroughly awakened by the rolling of the stone from the sepulchre, and all their attention attracted toward the body of Jesus, nor is it conceivable, that it could have escaped the marked notice of some of them,

had it been visibly removed in any form. But it wholly eludes their observation—it is gone, and they can give no account of it, while they agree in a particular description of the aspect, dress, and proceedings of the awful being who had appeared to them from invisibility. Thus they attest two most unexpected and astonishing miracles, little creditable to themselves, and which must appear to their employers, and even to them, most incredible and unsatisfactory; the arrival of an unknown person, who by his appearance alone overcame all their military prowess, and the disappearance of the body of Jesus, in a manner which eluded their utmost vigilance.

The word σεισμος, rendered *earthquake,* (v. 2.) observes Le Clerc, "is well interpreted of *a concussion of the air;* for in the Septuagint, the whirlwind by which Elijah was caught up into heaven, is called σωσειμος, (2 Kings xi. 11)." In our common version, Mat. viii. 24, the same word, σεισμος, is rendered *tempest.* Is it not probable that this phenomenon was an immediate attendant upon the resurrection and translation of Jesus; as of the latter event in the case of that distinguished prophet? Though the watchmen did not discern the person of Jesus, they were very sensible to an extraordinary movement in the atmosphere by which he was withdrawn from their power and cognizance. The visible manifestation of the angel is itself a strong indication that Jesus had undergone the opposite change, as his own appearance, in all the glory of his power, would have equally overawed his enemies, and thus have superseded that of the celestial messenger. But this, instead of opposing, would have coincided with the workings of their own imaginations, with which it would have been extremely liable to have been confounded; more especially, as from this time forward, he was ordinarily invisible. On the other hand, the appearance of the angel descending from heaven, was, in every point of view, a proper accompaniment of our Lord's transition to that celestial state. It was a succedaneum for his presence, which summoned the attention of the watchmen from all the objects with which their minds were pre-occupied, to the contemplation of realities, alike palpable, and opposed to their anticipations. The whole arrangement completely defeated the objects for which they were appointed to their office, by at once overcoming their strength and eluding their vigilance. It moreover afforded a double

proof of the great event we are contemplating, by the removal of the body and person of Jesus from the view of the most vigilant observers; and by exhibiting the angel *from* that invisible state into which he was translated. For what other purpose did this "angel descend from heaven," but to deliver him from the power of his enemies, and of death itself, and conduct him to the same state of beatific existence;—and why was he now removed from the view of mortals, but to be introduced into the society of beings of a higher order?

A more decided proof of the resurrection and translation of a human being from the insensibility of death to a state of immortality, could not have been exhibited in the presence of enemies. They well knew that the body of Jesus was secured in a new sepulchre, wherein "no man had" previously "been laid;" and, consequently, that, as it could not be confounded with other bodies, its continuance or removal could be fully ascertained. They had the evidence of their senses that it was as certainly withdrawn and translated into invisibility, as that an angel had appeared from the invisible state for the purpose of effecting it. The same person, therefore—the same organized frame which had previously passed through the state of humanity, had now undergone a complete translation, and, from all the attending circumstances, there was every reason to conclude that the mortal body was translated to a state of immortality; and, consequently, that the vital and mental powers resulting from its organization, had been, in like manner, elevated above the power of corruption.

Here, let it be observed, how inseparably the vital and intellectual being of Jesus is connected with his bodily frame; when that was disarranged, no traces of any mental power appeared; but when that was re-organized and translated, he was elevated to a state of immortal blessedness. And as the man is inseparable from his corporeal organization, so his sameness depends on certain characteristics of identity appertaining to it, when it has undergone its great change from mortality to immortality. But though the *organization* of the body retains its characteristic sameness when it shall have "put on immortality," it is evident that its *materials* undergo a greater change in this translation, than any to which they can be subjected, in the ordinary course of nature. We need,

therefore, be under no apprehension that the same Being, who effected so immense a change in the materials which composed the body of Jesus, and yet retained his essential identity, can produce a corresponding effect in the re-organization and translation of any number of human beings, out of any materials he may think proper; or rather by means wholly independent of what we term matter. Our ideas are confined by those objects of sensation whence they derive their origin; but the Divine Energies range through all infinity; nothing can circumscribe the power of God but his wisdom; nothing actuate or restrain his proceedings but his goodness; he can produce and arrange both matter and mind at his pleasure; can renew, enlarge, and refine the corporeal and mental powers of a rational creature to any degrees, and yet preserve their essential sameness; nay, it appears to me, that the radicals of the same mental powers being preserved or renewed, the principle of conscious identity must be proportionately advanced, and self-knowledge and possession must proceed with the general advances of the intellectual and moral powers, inseparably connected, as they probably are, with a corporeal system more or less gross or refined.

HOMO.

The Unitarian.—No. 3.

IF the Unity and absolute Supremacy of Jehovah, be indeed the fundamental, the pervading doctrine of the whole Holy Scriptures, as I have endeavoured to prove in my foregoing papers, then no detached text or passage can, in any degree, be opposed to it: for the Scriptures of truth cannot teach doctrines inconsistent with each other; and, therefore, every passage which seemingly teaches a contrary doctrine, must do so *only* in appearance, and can, in every case, easily be explained in conformity with the prevailing tenor of the Scriptures,—to prove which, will be the object of this and the two following papers.

Before, however, we proceed to examine the passages of Scripture which Trinitarians have supposed to favour their doctrines, it will be necessary to lay down a few simple rules for the interpretation of Scriptures. 1. We must examine whether the text be genuine, and rightly translated in the opinion of the most learned critics of all

parties; and then endeavour to ascertain its true import, and the correctness of the application of it. 2. In order to discover the true meaning of a disputed text, we must consider its connection, the design of the writer, his peculiar phraseology, the customs and modes of thinking in the age in which he wrote. 3. Those texts which are "obscure, figurative, or difficult, must be interpreted by those which are plain and easy to be understood." If a passage will admit of two meanings, we must take that which best accords with the general tenor of Scripture. "There is no profound learning, no metaphysical subtlety," observes Mr. Belsham, "necessary to settle the important question concerning the person of Christ; the inquiry is into a plain matter of fact; which is to be determined like any other fact, by its specific evidence—the evidence of plain unequivocal testimony, for judging of which, no other qualifications are requisite, than a sound understanding, and an honest mind."*

1 John v. 7, 8, "For there are three which bear record *in heaven: the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one. And there are three that bear witness on earth:* the spirit, the water, and the blood, and these three agree in one." This text, at least so much of it as is printed in Italics, is, I think, decidedly spurious. It is so considered by Bishop Lowth, who denies the use of understanding to the man who defends it; by Dr. Middleton, by the late Bishop of Lincoln, by Bishop Marsh, and by Archbishop Newcome, editor of a new version of the New Testament; by Erasmus, and Zuinglius, and

* It may be as well to notice here, that the authorities which I shall employ in this and the following papers, will be, "Clarke's Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity," 8vo. 1712; Belsham's "Calm Inquiry into the Scripture Doctrine concerning the Person of Christ," 8vo. 1811; Carpenter's "Unitarianism the Doctrine of the Gospel," 3d ed. 12mo. 1823; Elton's "Appeal to Scripture and Tradition, in Defence of the Unitarian Faith," 12mo. 1818; his "Plea for the Nazarenes: in Reply to the British Reviewer," 8vo. 1821; Wright's "Plain View of the Unitarian Christian Doctrine," 12mo. 1815; and the thirteen volumes of the "Christian Reformer." I shall, also, occasionally make use of other authorities, as "Lardner's Letter on the Logos," &c. I shall not often refer to the volume or page from which I quote; in many cases this will be impossible, but shall freely make use of whatever appears to suit my purpose, my design being not so much to state any thing new on the subjects which I shall attempt to illustrate, as to condense, and make as clear and as easy to be understood as I can, the evidences of reason and Scripture, in favour of the doctrines of Unitarian Christianity, and against those which are opposed to it.

Luther, whose dying request it was, that his translation should not be altered; by Michaelis, and Simon, and Wetstein. It is omitted in the editions of Aldus, of Strasburgh, of Colinæas, and in those of Harwood and Matthæi; and is marked as doubtful in those of Bullinger, and of Bowyer, and Knapp. It is rejected by Griesbach, the most eminent biblical critic of modern times; by Porson, the unrivalled Greek scholar; by Professor Stuart, the American Theologian; by Charles Butler, the Roman Catholic, and Adam Clarke, the Methodist, author of a most powerful and critical commentary on the Holy Scriptures; by the Quarterly Reviewers, the champions of the English Church; and by the Eclectic Reviewers, the organs of Trinitarian Dissenters; and if to these we add the names of Newton and Locke, Lardner and Milton, of Priestley and Lindsey, Belsham, Carpenter, and Wardlaw, we shall find the most eminent critics of all parties in the Christian world, united in their opinion against this text, and in the expulsion of it from those Scriptures in which they all alike believe and trust.

The reasons for which these excellent and learned men have rejected this text, are briefly these. It is found in no Greek manuscript older than the fifteenth century, and in no Latin one older than the ninth. It is not found in any of the ancient versions; it is not cited by any of the Greek ecclesiastical Fathers, some of whom (particularly Athanasius) have ransacked the whole New Testament for proofs of a Trinity; and have actually quoted the words before and after it. It is not quoted by any of the Latin Fathers, even where it would have been most pertinent, and where the subject seemed to require it. The sense is much more complete without it, as any one may see by reading over the passage, leaving out the words in question, thus: "For there are three that bear record," "the Spirit, the water, and the blood, and these three agree in one." It would then form, I think, a natural and proper conclusion to the sixth verse, for "the blood" and "the Spirit" are all mentioned there, but not a word is said about the "Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost." But this text, even if it were genuine, would no more prove that the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, are "three persons and one God," than it would prove that the Spirit, the water, and the blood, are so. *Calvin* says, on this text, "Three are one, does *not* denote the essence, but the consent."

Mat. xxviii. 19, "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations; baptising them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." I cannot agree with N. B. (Christian Pioneer, vol. i. p. 271,) that this text is a forgery; it is found in all the manuscripts and all the versions, and this is with me conclusive evidence in its favour. It is nowhere said in this text, that the three persons here mentioned are equal to each other, or that they are one God; and surely none but those who have elsewhere got the idea, that there are three equal, co-eternal, and co-existent persons in the Godhead, would find it in this text. "That baptism into the name of any one, signifies no more than an acknowledgment of his authority," "is evident from what the Apostle says of the Israelites, 1 Cor. x. 2, that they were 'baptized into Moses;' and when the same Apostle expresses his apprehensions, 1 Cor. i. 15, 'lest any should say he had baptized into his own name,' he could not suspect that they would represent him as claiming divine honours, but merely as assuming to be the head and leader of a Christian sect." (Belsham, p. 363). The Son and the Holy Spirit being named with the Father, is no more proof that they are equal with Him, than that Moses and the elect angels are so, because it is said, Exod. xiv. 3, that the children of Israel "feared the Lord, and blessed the Lord, and his servant Moses," or Paul charged Timothy, 1 Tim. i. 21, "before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, and the elect angels." See other examples of the same construction, 1 Sam. xii. 28, and 1 Chron. xxix. 20. These words were never used by the Apostles as a formula of Baptism, for they baptized "in the name of Jesus Christ."—(See Acts ii. 38, viii. 16, x. 48, xix. 5; Rom. vi. 3; Gal. iii. 27). The sense of the passage appears to me clearly to be, "Baptizing them into the profession of that religion, which originated in the Father's love, was communicated to mankind by his Son Jesus Christ, and was confirmed by the miraculous gift of of his Holy Spirit."

The same remarks will apply to 2 Cor. xiii. 14, "The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all." "As if he had said," says Mr. Belsham, "May you all enjoy the inestimable blessings of the Gospel of Christ, the favour of God, and the gift and influence of the Holy Spirit."

Another supposed proof of the Trinity, is found in the

Hebrew word for God, "Aleim" or "Elohim," which, having a plural termination, is supposed to express a plurality of persons in the Godhead. But (not now to mention the vagueness of such a proof), if we consider that the Jews, who must certainly have understood their own language, never thought this meant anything inconsistent with the strict Unity of Jehovah; and certainly never found a Trinity in it; if we consider, that it is applied not only to the true God, but to Baal, Dagon, Astaroth, &c.—is applied to one angel, in Judges xiii. 22—to one man, Moses, in Exod. iv. 16, and vii. 1, and to the golden calf, xxxii. 4—that it is used with singular pronouns and verbs, in numberless passages in the Old Testament—in Isaiah xlix. 9, "*I am* God and there is none else, *I am* God and there is none like *me*," and in Isaiah xliv. 6, 8; xlv. 5, 21, 22; xl. 25, and in many other places, (See No. I. page 13 of this volume);—that there are many other Hebrew words which have a plural termination, but which have never been supposed necessarily to denote a plurality; that this word was used by our Lord in the singular, and has been so translated throughout the New Testament, the Greek Septuagint, the ancient Versions, the Latin Vulgate, and all the modern languages; and if we consider, lastly, that in the Hebrew idiom, as in that of many other languages, "the plural form is used to express eminence, dignity, and dominion; and that, with this intent, nouns plural are often coupled with a verb singular" (Elton's Appeal, p. 79),—this supposed proof of the Trinity will be found to be without foundation. (See vol. i. p. 369).

Again.—Trinitarians find another fancied proof of the Trinity in the words "Let *us* make man in our *image*," (Gen. i. 26); and in the other passages where the plural form of expression is used; (Gen. iii. 22, and xi. 7, Isaiah vi. 8). "It is obviously absurd," says Mr. Elton (Appeal p. 78), "to consider the narrative language employed by Moses, as meant to reveal, from inspiration, the literal words that God spake; for the very idea of *speech* in God, is in accommodation only to our apprehensions of things; the audible utterance of a voice from God, was in itself an extraordinary miracle." "The late Dr. Taylor," says Mr. Wright, p. 418, "remarks on the above passages, 'the plural number is used, but, according to the genius of the Hebrew language, this is only a magnificent way of ex-

pressing the majesty of God; and amounts to no more than this—'And God said, *I will* make man;' Go to and let us go down,' *i. e.* 'I will go down.'" Or the word "us" may be understood of the angels, "to show God, might be supposed to be declaring his purpose, and deliberating with them on its accomplishment;" and there can be no impropriety in God using the term "us," in reference to angelic natures, since angels are styled "the sons of God." The plural is never used by the Deity, except in the above passages; everywhere else, the God of the Universe is represented as using the singular pronouns, "I" and "me;" see particularly the texts cited and referred to in the foregoing page.

This doctrine has been attempted, also, to be supported by such texts as the following: "The Lord God of their Fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, the God of Jacob, hath appeared unto thee" (Exod. iv. 5). "Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty! which was, and is, and is to come" (Rev. iv. 8). Because the words, "God" and "holy" are repeated three times, it is contended that they refer to three distinct persons; the same argument might, with equal propriety, be adduced in favour of there being four Gods, from Exod. iii. 6, or of there being three earths, from Jer. xxii. 29: "O earth, earth, earth, hear the Word of the Lord." The words are in every instance only repeated for the sake of emphasis. I have also seen, Ps. xxxiii. 6, "By the Word of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the hosts of them by the breath (spirit) of his mouth," quoted as a text, in which the three persons of the Godhead, "the Word," "the Lord," and "the Spirit," are mentioned together; but surely this will require no comment.

And where in *all* these passages can men find the doctrine, that "in the Unity of the Godhead, there be three persons of one substance, power, and eternity; the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost"? (Article I.) Where can they find it declared, that "the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God, and yet there are not three Gods, but one God"? (Athanasian Creed.) And where can they find the command to pray, "O holy, blessed, and glorious Trinity; three persons and one God; have mercy upon us"? (Litany.) No where. And is it on evidence slight as this, that men have dared to set aside the uniform testimony of the Scriptures; declaring

in terms the most emphatic and forcible ever dictated by the voice of Revelation, the simple Unity, and absolute and unrivalled supremacy of Jehovah? Is it on evidence slight as this, that they refuse to obey the plain command and to follow the recorded example of Jesus Christ, and of his Apostles, and to pray as they prayed? How long will men set up their own dogmas against the revealed Word of God? How long will they prefer human decrees to the teachings of the Gospel of Christ?

But, then, Trinitarians tell us, that Christ is called God, in many parts of the Scriptures; these passages it shall be our task to examine, and I hope to be able to show, that they strengthen, instead of opposing, the clear and decisive evidence of his inferiority to Jehovah, which I have before produced. Γαμμα.

REVIEW.

"*The Process of Historical Proof exemplified and explained.*"—*By Isaac Taylor.*

The evidence in favour of Christianity, has suffered much at the hands even of its friends, and that chiefly in two ways; an adventitious principle, termed faith, has been associated with this subject, seeming, at least, to require the obedience of the understanding, without supplying the requisite elements, and implying the agency of another cause of belief, than is recognised in our judgments and decisions in the affairs of the world. Thousands who have sought for evidence, have been told, they must seek for faith in its stead. Faith and evidence have thus been placed in opposition; and in the minds of thinking men, they often wear an aspect of hostility and variance. The proper view of the subject is, that evidence leads to faith or belief: not that belief leads to or supersedes evidence. The scribe well instructed in his Master's will, asks for no belief, except so far as he supplies proof, and warns every man from pretending to impossibilities, *viz.* of believing without evidence. Another defect in the manner of treating the Christian evidences, has consisted in not exhibiting the subject as one of a purely historical character, and to be determined upon the same principles as all

other historical questions. We do not say that this has been wholly lost sight of; but it has not received that attention—it has not been made so prominent, as its merits deserve. Exhibit the subject in this manner, and then you involve unbelievers in this dilemma—either of rejecting all historical statements indiscriminately, or of acknowledging the truth of Christianity. There is, we contend, no alternative. In order to show this fact in all its force, we have, for a long time, deemed a treatise a great desideratum, which should exhibit the proof by which the credibility of any ancient historian was established, with a view to set this proof in juxta position with the historical evidence of Christianity. The volume now before us, admirably supplies the deficiency. The author has chosen the History of Herodotus; and by a series of arguments, exhibits the mode in which scholars have been, and in which now every one may be, satisfied of the general truth and certainty of the history he composed. No one can read the arguments, and fail to be satisfied; and then, how can he reject Christianity? The proof is of the same nature, only more perfect; and what is more, it embraces lines of evidence, of which the History of Herodotus is not susceptible. Let us hear Mr. Taylor, "Our argument has been drawn from one species of evidence—the testimony of contemporary and succeeding writers. Before we pass on, we may take the occasion to put out a possible augmentation of it. Suppose, then, that after tracing, as we have done, the history of the work in question, through a continued series of quotations in the Greek and Latin writers, and obtaining by that means a conclusive proof of its antiquity, it were discovered that there is in existence a Persian translation of Herodotus, ascertained by the peculiarities of its style, as well as by external evidence, to have been executed in the time of Artaxerxes. Another translation of the same work is then brought forward, in the ancient language of Carthage, which, except in this translation, has been long extinct. And another in the Coptic or ancient language of Egypt; another in the Latin, of the times of P. Curtius and Terence. If these translations had descended to us through an independent channel; if each possessed a separate mass of evidence in proof of its antiquity; and if, when collated among themselves, and with the Greek original, they were found to harmonize, then, and in such a case, we should

possess so many distinct demonstrations—each of them perfect by itself—of the antiquity and integrity of the text now in our hands. This sort of redundant demonstration does not belong to the Greek historian; but it is possessed in full, by the Jewish and Christian Scriptures."

The following remarks, deducing the credibility and truth of a history from the acknowledgment of its authenticity, and its reception by contemporary and succeeding writers, are exceedingly forcible, and may be applied as well to the Christian Scriptures, as to Herodotus.

"In a civilized and lettered community, where a free expression of opinion is allowed, and where opposing interests actually exist, a writer who professes to compile an authentic account of transactions that are still fresh in the recollection of the people, can move only within certain limits, even if he wishes to misrepresent facts. Circumstances known only to a few, may be falsified—motives may be maligned—actions may be exaggerated—wrongs and sufferings may be coloured by rhetorical declamations—fair characters may be defamed, and foul ones eulogised; these are the boundaries of falsification. But if personages altogether fictitious, are made the heroes of the story; if invasions, battles, sieges, conspiracies, are described which never happened; if, in a word, the narrative is a fiction, then it ranks in a different class of productions, and could never gain credit as an authentic account of real and recent events. The same evidence, therefore, which establishes the existence of an historical work, at a time near to that of the events it records, establishes also the *general authenticity* of the narrative; for the work is not only mentioned by contemporary writers, but mentioned as a professed and acknowledged *history*. This character, granted to the book by the author's contemporaries, contains, by condensation, the suffrages of the whole community. In substance, we hear the people of Greece assenting to the historian, on those principal portions of his narrative, at least, of which they were qualified to form an opinion, and relative to which no writer would attempt to deceive them."

It is to be regretted, that the author has used the term authenticity, so as to breed confusion in men's ideas. There are two questions to be considered, in judging whether or not an ancient work is to be received. First, Whether it was written by the author whose name it

bears? Secondly, Whether it be credible? The first question relating to the *authorship*, is, in proper language, termed the *authenticity;* the second, the credibility. Now, our author uses genuineness for authenticity, and authenticity for credibility. But genuineness is contrasted with spuriousness, and does not inquire into the question of authorship; and authenticity is contrasted with fiction and imposture, and does not in itself regard credibility. And if the usages of the language did not require the appropriation of the terms above-mentioned, yet the obvious meaning of the words, authenticity and credibility—the one so evidently inquiring as to the authorship, the other, as to whether the facts related are worthy of credit, this alone promoting, as it would, clearness and distinctness of apprehension—is a sufficient recommendation to such phraseology. We are aware, that the names of Watson, Paley, and others, may be brought against us. And we regret, that their authority has been followed by later writers, when equal weight may be found in the name of Bishop Marsh, who, in his admirable lectures, vindicates for the words, the meanings and appropriation now stated. Let no one think the matter one of small importance; there can be no clear convictions, without clear phraseology; and he that improves the usages of words, does much to improve the practices of things. How much does chemistry owe to a reformed nomenclature? And how much of the disputes in divinity are about words, which precision in the use of terms, would set to rest?

In the ensuing passage, an old argument is put in a new and irresistible manner: "And surely *knavery* is not, of all vices, that one which may be long practised without corrupting the heart; on the contrary, while other vices deprave the moral sentiments only by slow degress, and long habitude in evil, *this*, in its first stage, indicates a soul already destitute of sensibility to good; and in its progression, produces a firmer induration of the conscience than any other. But if the hardening influence of vice admits of another degree of intensity, we must say that knavery, in matters of religion, is the crime which, beyond all others, debases, deadens, petrifies the human heart. *Yet if Christianity was not true, then the authors of the purest morality in the world were, what a long continued perpetration of impious frauds must render men.*"—"These teachers advance a pretension, which, if it was

not real, places them in the very front of the hosts of evil-doers. And if they must, indeed, be marshalled with deceivers, then there remains the prodigious consequence—that the purest stream has issued from the foulest source."

The writer, with similar power of thought and expression, proceeds to remark on several points of the Christian evidences. We do not pretend that our concurrence with what he says, is univeral; but in most of his observations we heartily acquiesce. And in laying aside the work, we feel that an important addition to the defences of our common faith has been made. With the concluding sentences of the volume, we shall terminate our notice of it, subjoining to the sentiments which it conveys (with some little modification), our most heartfelt Amen. "Though there are still, and may yet be, those who, so long as the argument rests quietly in books, will continue to spurn reason, the time will come when attention towards it shall be quickened; men shall feel their personal interest in the question; the films of sophistry shall be broken, as the gossamer of the morning by the foot of Behemoth. The common conviction shall be strong and loud, and shall bear down, with a crushing force, upon the band of malignants, whom Truth would never move. The time shall come, perhaps it is not distant, when of all the errors that have made sport of the human mind, the most strange, as well as the most fatal, shall seem—the disbelief of Christianity." G. C. S.

Ireland.

Expurgatorial Committee, Auxiliary to the "Presbyterian Inquisition."—A Meeting was held lately by the Committee appointed by the Synod of Ulster, for examining into the state of their Students' Theological Library. We should scarcely have deemed it necessary to notice this circumstance, were it not that their proceedings were so much in keeping with those of the "Presbyterian Inquisition," as to render it worthy a passing remark. It is true only four members attended:—Messrs. J. S. Reid, Carrickfergus; Bellis, Belfast; Dill, Carnmoney; and Wallace, Holywood; but the want of numbers was fully compensated by the very efficient manner in which they set to work; for in a very short time, and without any other examination than a hurried inspection of the catalogue, they purged the Library of upwards of 70 volumes. We had no reporter present; but we may suppose the proceedings to have taken somewhat like the following turn:—

During part of the operation, the Professor and Students who were present, stood amazed; but, after some time, collecting a little resolution, they ventured to interfere. "Surely," said Dr. Hanna, "you will not thus so unceremoniously outlaw these books, which I and my students selected as best fit for their use?" "Sir," replied Mr. Wallace, "it is now fully *two* years since I was a student, and sure my opinion should have weight; and I beg to tell you, that these books are highly improper for a Theological Library!"—"At least," said a Student, with considerable agitation, "we may be allowed to retain this copy of Kirwan's Sermons, which may serve as a specimen of that spirited and popular eloquence, by which Divine truth may be brought home to the heart with effect?"—"Young man," replied Mr. Bellis, "you err greatly in your opinion respecting pulpit oratory. The truths of the Gospel should never be disfigured, nor the reflections of a worshipping audience disturbed, by a single burst of energetic or popular eloquence! Besides, there is danger that you should get into the habit of consulting printed sermons *too freely*, if you should happen to have access to them; and *you* are not aware how difficult it is either to repeat or read from your own transcript, without blundering, the composition of another."—"You will consider, however," interposed a second Student, "that as the Divinity class purchased these books, they have some right to hope that you will respect their property?"—"I tell you, young gentleman," said Mr. Reid, "if you interfere farther with us in the discharge of our expurgatorial duty, I will enter your names in my scroll, and when you come before 'the Inquisition,' you will perhaps find that your claims to any property in this Library, or any privileges under the Synod of Ulster, rest on a very fallacious foundation!" This argument was, of course, conclusive, and the Committee met with no farther interference.

If we could be surprised at any act of a Committee of the Synod of Ulster, these proceedings might produce that effect. It might be supposed that Dr. Hanna, whose attainments no one will venture to question, should be in some degree qualified for directing his students in the purchase of books, and that these half-fledged Theologians would scarcely venture to put forward their judgments in opposition; and it might be expected, that as the students are *compelled* to subscribe largely to the Library, they should be permitted to have some influence in the choice of books. But this would not be in accordance with the plans of the Synod. They are determined that their future ministers shall be trained up according to their own spirit; and it is most essential for that purpose, that they commence examining the sources from which they may derive information. We stop not to inquire what books have been cancelled at present; but when the system is once commenced, where is it to terminate? No such expurgatorial censorship is assumed, even by the alleged exclusionists of Roman Catholic Colleges; and we doubt not, that if Maynooth College were to furnish such an example, it would afford a topic of declamation for weeks, in every Orange Journal in the kingdom.—*Northern Whig.*

THE

CHRISTIAN PIONEER.

No. 30. FEBRUARY, 1829. Vol. III.

To the Editor of the Christian Pioneer.

SIR,

THE Confession of Faith teaches of the Lord Jesus Christ, "that two whole perfect and distinct natures, the Godhead and the Manhood, were inseparably joined together in one person, without conversion, composition, or confusion,"* &c. In theology, the term *nature* is somewhat vague and indefinite; I understand it to mean the essential properties of any thing,—that which pertains to, and is inseparable from its being and existence. By human nature, I mean mental constitution and disposition—the feelings, desires, and affections of humanity; by divine nature, supreme perfection, spiritual intelligence, universal mind. A nature, therefore, cannot be a person, or possess distinct and independent existence; neither the divine nor human nature can exist abstractedly, but must be inherent in some being or essence: we can no more speak of nature as an abstract existence, and separate from the substance to which it belongs, than we can speak of the properties of things, as weight, shape, colour, &c. in the abstract, and without relation to material substances. "A mere quality cannot have an abstract existence, it must be a quality of some substance."

The person of Jesus Christ is admitted to be strictly and physically corporeal (as will be proved subsequently), in which existed two distinct natures. From two natures, we infer two minds or intelligences; intelligence implies consciousness, and the latter, personal identity. Therefore, Jesus possessing two natures, must be conscious of two personal existences. Again, a finite nature must be inherent in a finite being, and an infinite nature in an infinite being; consequently, Jesus was both a finite and an infinite being: but as two opposite beings could not exist as one and the same being, or be combined in one person, therefore Jesus must have existed as two. Yet Jesus was *one* being—a man.

* Confession of Faith, Chap. viii. 2.

A finite being cannot possess infinite attributes, for it would then cease to be finite; the divine nature of Jesus is conscious of possessing infinity, whilst his human nature is equally conscious that it is finite. Hence, he was conscious of being both finite and infinite at the same time—a palpable contradiction. The same may be said of the other attributes of Deity—eternity, omnipotence, &c.

The divine and human natures were united in the person of Jesus, never to be divided. Whatever, therefore, is predicated of him, must be predicated of his whole being, whatever that may be,* unless it can be proved that a nature can exist abstractedly, and is not a component part of the being in which it is inherent. Even if this could be done, it would be useless with respect to those who believe that the two natures are "*inseparably* joined together in one person;" nor can they truly affirm of one event, that it relates to the divine, and of another, that it is referable to the human nature of Jesus.

Supposing the union of the two natures:—the human, being inferior to, must, therefore, be subservient to the divine nature; if so, what is predicated of Jesus, must be predicated of his divine nature, and of that only, as by it, he would be influenced—by its superior impulses, he would speak and act, &c. When, therefore, he asserts, that he came not to do his own will, it must be understood, that his own will, the will of his divine nature, was subordinate to that of his heavenly Father. The commands of the Father were obeyed by Jesus, (John xiv. 31; xv. 10; xii. 49, 50); and his divine nature being the originator of his actions, his divine nature was, therefore, obedient to the commands of the Father.

Jesus Christ was sent. The question arises, By whom? by his Godhead—his divine nature? He was sent by the

---

* Dr. Wardlaw, probably wishing to retreat with seeming honour from an unpalatable controversy with Mr. Yates, has manifested a little adroitness in his attempt to obscure the real strength and tendency of the argument, by directing the attention of his antagonist to the rebutment of an opprobrious imputation. Allowing even that Mr. Yates erred in using the word *mind*, still his argument changing the term is the same, without the abatement of one jot or particle of its original force; for, whether finite helplessness and infinite plenitude be combined in one mind, or in one person, the contradiction is equally obvious.

Dr. Wardlaw, and the Assembly's Catechism, would have been both condemned as heretical, at the period when Orthodoxy taught the *unity* of Christ's nature. The doctrine of the *two* natures was *established* in the pontificate of Leo, about the middle of the 5th century.

Father, John xiv. 24. Was the Father, then, the divine nature of Jesus? If not, then that nature was sent by him—was therefore inferior to him, and consequently obedient to his will. If it was the Father, then was the Father *inseparably joined* to the human nature in one person, and the spirituality of the Godhead is destroyed, because the person is a human being. And as that person was crucified, died, and was buried, the same must be said of the eternal Deity!

But when the advocates of Trinitarianism use the term person with reference to God, its mystic signification is anything or nothing, and it has been the fruitful subject of many extravagant or contradictory definitions. Sometimes, discarded as not being sufficiently significant, and phrase after phrase substituted in its stead; these abandoned, from the insuperable objections to which they were liable, and the term again received as canonical, but so altered, modified, and amended, as to be a symbol without a corresponding idea, now meaning more, now less, than its usual acceptation, and although never used except to express an idea, yet carefully guarded from the erroneous one to which it is generally attached, and which indeed, whatever may be said to the contrary, it invariably and universally represents.

Nor is the Oxford logician, Dr. Whately, more fortunate than his predecessors, when he affirms, that the term *person* as applied to the Trinity, originally meant, and ought therefore now to be understood simply as an indication of character, and not of being;* because a somewhat higher authority than even the learned Principal of St. Albans, the existing standards of orthodoxy, namely, the Book of Common Prayer, and the Assembly's Catechism, &c. teach a different doctrine. And although the Liturgy of the Southern Church may show evident traces of being the workmanship of creed compilers, rather than of creed makers, yet the authorised manual of her northern sister, amply testifies, that the authors thereof, have manufactured a yoke not a whit inferior to that of any other reformed church, in oppressiveness; if, indeed, compared with it, their creeds are not easy, and their burdens light.

Both the Kirk of Scotland, and she of England, appear to me to teach the real and corporeal personality of the God-

* Christian Pioneer, vol. iii. p. 113.

head. The Kirk affirms, that "in the unity of the Godhead there be three persons of one substance, power, and eternity, God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost," &c.* If this be true, (and that it is, who dare dispute?) the three persons of the Godhead being of *one substance,* if we can discover the formation of any one of those persons, we acquire it of the whole. Now, "the Son of God, the Second Person in the Trinity, being very and eternal God, of one substance and equal with the Father, did, when the fulness of time was come, take upon him man's nature with all the essential properties and common infirmities thereof, yet without sin: being conceived, by the power of the Holy Ghost, of the substance of the Virgin Mary; so that two whole perfect and and distinct natures, the Godhead and the manhood, were inseparably joined together in one person, without conversion, composition, or confusion—which person is very God and very man," &c.† The Second Person of the Trinity was a human being, by descent from his mother—of her substance. He could not be other than a human being, because, possessing ALL *the essential properties of man's nature,*‡ the said nature being also perfect;—a most essential property, being the possession of a human body, united to the human nature—the medium and vehicle of its existence. And the Catechism teaches us, that the Second Person "being the eternal Son of God, of one substance and equal with the Father, in the fulness of time became man, and so was and continued to be God and man in two entire distinct natures, and one person for ever." And he "became man, by taking to himself a true body and a reasonable soul," &c. &c.‖

The Second Person of the Trinity, therefore, being composed of two whole and perfect natures, residing in one person, that person being a man—a true body, and is so to continue for ever; it follows, that all the three persons, being of one substance, all must equally possess this corporeal formation. Such is the inference from the teachings of the Kirk of Scotland; that its direct and obvious tendency merges in Tritheism, cannot, I presume, be denied.

---

* Confession of Faith, chap. ii. 3. † *Ibid.* chap. viii. 2.

‡ The Christian Unitarian believes, upon a higher testimony, that his Lord and Master was a man. See, amongst other passages, Acts ii. 22; John viii. 40; 1 Tim. ii. 5.

‖ Larger Catechism, Quest. 36 and 37.

The Church of England, in that luminous exposé of the doctrine of the Trinity, styled the Creed of St. Athanasius, teaches, "that there is one person of the Father, and another of the Son, and another of the Holy Ghost; but the Godhead of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, *is all one*, the glory equal, the majesty coeternal; such as the Father is, such is the Son, and such is the Holy Ghost." Now, from the same high authority, we learn, that the Second Person of the Trinity is "God and Man"—that he is "man of the substance of his mother, born in the world, *perfect God* and perfect man*, of a reasonable soul, and human flesh subsisting;" which, says the Second Article, "were joined together in one person, never to be divided." This, being the formation of the Second Person of the Trinity, must be that of all the persons, because such as one is, so are all. The Godhead is all one; that of Jesus, is inseparably united to a *person* of human flesh; therefore, that of the Father, and of the Holy Ghost, must be so united. The Son being perfect man as well as God, the Father must be so likewise; and the Son being a distinct personal existence, the Father and Holy Ghost must, in the same sense, possess personal existences, and three distinct persons, each being God, are three Gods!

That in the worship of the Church of England, a Man-God is the object of adoration, cannot surely be denied, when, in the language of the Litany, he is invoked, the Trinity is called upon "by the mystery of thy holy incarnation, by thy holy nativity and circumcision, by thy baptism, fasting, and temptation, good Lord deliver us. By thine agony and bloody sweat, by thy cross and passion, by thy precious death and burial, by thy glorious resurrection and ascension, and by the coming of the Holy Ghost, good Lord deliver us." And yet missionaries are, by the utterers of such prayers, sent to Hindostan, to convert the natives from idolatry!

If ideas are to be attached to words—if devotion is to be regarded as a reasonable service—if established religion means any thing,—a personal Trinity, in its most literal acceptation, is the orthodox doctrine of these realms. But Jesus teaches, that "*God is a Spirit*," and also, that "they who worship him, must worship him in spirit and in truth."

D. S.

* Perfect God!—are there, then, imperfect Gods?

LETTER IV.

On the Suitability of the Witnesses to the Resurrection of Jesus.

Jesus having been translated to an invisible state, he did not become visible to his enemies at that time, nor was he manifested to strangers; and, indeed, it is probable that any such manifestations would have afforded far less indubitable proofs, either of his resurrection or translation to a superior state of being, than those evidences which were actually adduced. This was a case very different from a return to the ordinary state of humanity, with a view to a permanent continuance in it; as any manifestations of his person could be only occasional and transitory, and could be fully ascertained only by appropriate persons, under suitable circumstances.

The sentiments of rage, guilt, or apprehension, with which his enemies in general, who had so recently concurred in his crucifixion, would be actuated, must render them peculiarly unfitted for such deliberate interviews with Jesus, as were necessary at once to ascertain his personal identity, and the extraordinary transition which he had undergone. This will appear more manifest, on our entering into a particular examination of the circumstances in which he presented himself, and withdrew from the observation of the disciples, and the effects thus produced upon *their* minds. If "*they*," on one occasion, "were terrified and affrighted, and supposed that they had seen a spirit," what must have been the state of mind of those who had been "*his betrayers and murderers?*" How susceptible many of the inhabitants of Jerusalem were, at that time, of the most fearful apprehensions, from the crime to which they had been accessary, appeared from the manner in which they were affected by the preaching of Peter. "Let," said he, "all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ. When they heard this they were pricked in their hearts, and said unto Peter and the rest of the Apostles, Men and brethren, what must we do?" When we reflect on the artless detail which these apostles have left of the life and miracles of Jesus, of the versatility of the Jewish populace, and the precipitate manner in which, after heaping upon him the most flattering honours, they were

persuaded by their leaders to unite with them in the cry for his crucifixion, we cannot but regard this as a very natural and probable representation of their state of mind, under the circumstances in which it is related. But if they were thus agitated with guilty apprehensions at the words of the Apostle, how could they have endured any such interviews with Jesus himself, as that which so terrified and affrighted even his guiltless friends and followers?

Such persons must have been totally disqualified for witnessing those scenes by which the apostles and others who had not been accessary to his death, were at length fully assured, both of his resurrection, and of his translation to a state in which he is no more subject to dissolution. Conscious, in a great degree, of their guilt, and probably not without apprehension, that as his predicted death had been realized, so his predicted resurrection would be accomplished, their own imaginations, unaided by any supernatural influence, would be apt to conjure up the dreaded form of the virtuous and dignified individual to whose barbarous and ignominious murder they had so rashly acceded. If therefore such a phenomenon had been presented to persons in this state of mind, it would have been almost necessarily confounded with the shapings of their imaginations, especially if in proof of his transition to an immortal existence, he appeared to them *from*, or passed *into* a state of invisibility. I therefore feel assured, that, for this reason, he did not show himself to any persons of this description; that is, to his enemies in general at that time; and the fact of his never having been even *supposed* to have been seen by any such persons, appears to me scarcely less deserving of admiration, as the probable result of a supernatural suppression of the illusions of fancy, than that Jesus, both in the ordinary state of humanity, and as an inhabitant of the invisible and immortal state, should have been thoroughly made known to persons who had no expectation of again seeing him, or any guilty apprehensions to fabricate images of his departed spirit. The miracles afterwards ascribed to the apostles, and particularly that unprecedented and remarkable miracle by which they were enabled fluently to announce his resurrection to an incorruptible state, in languages which they had never learned, together with the freedom, and undaunted and persevering courage with which men previously so timid, maintained it in the face of his destroyers, were far better suited to afford unequi-

vocal evidence, both to them and to strangers unacquainted with Jesus, than any manifestations of his person to either of these descriptions of men: that is, to the generality both of Jews and Gentiles.

Admitting that our Lord was translated to an invisible state at the moment of his resurrection, as we have already seen from the actual testimony of his enemies, the subsequent manifestations of his person could reasonably be expected to be afforded only to competent witnesses, who, after receiving indubitable evidence of the facts, should be enabled to present proofs no less indubitable, of their reality, to the world at large. If the Jewish and Gentile people in general, and particularly those who were acquainted with his person, were peculiarly unfitted by their state of mind for being introduced to him, that of the apostles, and probably of many persons in Galilee, appears to have been such as peculiarly fitted them for such interviews. They were exempt from those guilty forebodings, which in a greater or less degree had seized the minds of many of his enemies, and from that aversion to beholding him restored to life, which must have been common to them all. They had not understood his predictions concerning either his death or his resurrection; and, consequently, when the former event had befallen him, they were thrown into the utmost despondency, and had evidently no conception whatever of its being, so shortly after, followed by the latter. They were his friends, but that friendship had arisen out of the proofs they had witnessed of his divine mission, and was evidently much connected with their hopes of promotion under him as a temporal Messiah, which hopes were now completely frustrated, or if remaining in any latent degree, could only be rekindled by the most palpable proofs of his resurrection. As Jews, regarding him in the light of their present temporal deliverer, they must sustain a bitter disappointment by his transition into an invisible state; nor does it appear that they had the most distant idea of any such event, till it was brought home to their minds by the most irresistible evidence. Their personal intimacy with him throughout his ministry, was a necessary preliminary, especially to that part of the evidence which related to the identity of his *mind and character*. They were persons the most unlikely to engage in any daring imposture to prove that he was alive, and exalted to the office of the Messiah, when withdrawn

from all ordinary observation, since they had never manifested much courage or address in forwarding his objects, even when he was taking the lead among them, by his personal presence and extraordinary exertions. If the numerous miracles which he professed to perform, and of which they appear to have entertained no doubt, had failed to inspire them with the courage which was necessary to encounter his enemies, having him as their visible leader, what but miracles, if possible, still more palpable and influential, could qualify them to become the great promoters of his cause, after that he had undergone a most cruel and ignominious death, and was no more to be recognized either as the Jewish Messiah, or even in the form of humanity?

The peculiar exemption of the apostles from any notion of the destined resurrection of Jesus, and their freedom from guilty forebodings, together with their intimate knowledge of him, rendered them the most proper subjects for witnessing such scenes as were afterwards presented to them; while their deficiency in courage and address would render the contrary spirit which they from that time forward maintained, a strong accompanying evidence that they had now witnessed and become influenced by miracles, which were capable of effecting an entire change in some of the most timid, unapt, and incredulous of men.

No delusions have been more common, or more powerful and pernicious, than those arising from imaginary appearances of the dead to the living. The heathens peopled their *hades* with those "shades," those "vain illusions," which are so often raised in the imaginations of the superstitious, and mistaken for external realities. Even those personages whom they elevated to celestial honours, and to whom they dedicated their temples and offered their devotions, attributing to them the power of wielding the elements, and determining the destinies of men, had passed through the ordinary state of humanity, and now lived and were deified only by the delusive powers of the imagination. The most celebrated of the Grecian bards, indeed, compares this state of the dead to "dreams, the vain illusions of the mind," and represents the most celebrated of his heroes as declaring that he had

> "Rather serve a hind that toils for bread,
> Than reign the sceptred monarch of the dead."

Nevertheless, upon this gloomy shadow of existence, this "baseless fabric" of dreams and reveries, all the ideas

of the heathens rested, respecting the future existence of man. They had, properly speaking, no conceptions of any existence independent of death; but their hopes, which were tottering to their foundations with the advances of reason and intelligence, were confined to these supposed shadowy remains of being, appertaining to death itself.

It was the great object of Christianity, as exemplified in the resurrection and translation of its founder, to prove a proper deliverance from death to a higher and more glorious life than the present; and over which death hath no power; a state, indeed, which is withdrawn from the ordinary observation of mortals, but which is no less *real* than it is *indestructible.* In evincing this point, it was not only necessary to exhibit the same Jesus, in the ordinary state of humanity, to men who well knew his person, life, and manners, but to show that these exhibitions were only *occasional*, and that he ordinarily possessed conscious existence and activity, with all that is essential to personal identity, in a state which is not cognizable by mortals. We have already made some some general mention of the means which were employed for these combined purposes; and shall now add, that in rendering such evidence indubitable, it was necessary that the states of mind of the individuals to whom the several phenomena were presented, should be such that they could not be the figments of the fancy, but must have been the effects of the objects being actually presented to their senses; and further, it was requisite, that the facts proving his ordinary existence in a state of invisibility should be sufficiently palpable, frequent, and attended with such a variety of circumstances, and should undergo such cool, deliberate examinations, by persons well acquainted with Jesus, and deeply interested in the knowledge of all that related to him, as should convey to their minds the utmost certainty that he was both restored to life, and with the preservation of all that was essential to his identity, had undergone a glorious transition to an immortal and celestial state. We trust, that, on a careful review of the several instances which are recorded relative to our Lord's manifestations, they will be found fully to answer these requisitions, and that they are, upon the whole, of the most satisfactory nature conceivable.

HOMO.

A Discourse delivered at the Ordination of the Rev. Frederick A. Farley, as Pastor of the Westminster Congregational Society, in Providence, Rhode Island, Sept. 10, 1828.—By William Ellery Channing, D. D.

Ephesians v. 1.—"Be ye therefore followers of God, as dear children."

To promote true religion is the purpose of the Christian ministry. For this it was ordained. On the present occasion, therefore, when a new teacher is to be given to the church, a discourse on the character of true religion, will not be inappropriate. I do not mean, that I shall attempt, in the limits to which I am now confined, to set before you all its properties, signs, and operations; for in so doing, I should burden your memories with divisions and vague generalities, as uninteresting as they would be unprofitable. My purpose is, to select one view of the subject, which seems to me of primary dignity and importance; and I select this, because it is greatly neglected, and because I attribute to this neglect, much of the inefficacy, and many of the corruptions of religion.

The text calls us to follow or imitate God, to seek accordance with or likeness to him; and to do this, not fearfully and faintly, but with the spirit and hope of beloved children. The doctrine, which I propose to illustrate, is derived immediately from these words, and is incorporated with the whole New Testament. I affirm, and would maintain, that true religion consists in proposing as our great end, a growing likeness to the Supreme Being. Its noblest influence, consists, in making us more and more partakers of the Divinity. For this it is to be preached. Religious instruction should aim chiefly to turn men's aspirations and efforts to that perfection of the soul, which constitutes it a bright image of God. Such is the topic now to be discussed; and I implore Him, whose glory I seek, to aid me in enforcing it with simplicity and clearness, with a calm and pure zeal, and with unfeigned charity.

I begin with observing, what all indeed will understand, that the likeness to God, of which I propose to speak, belongs to man's higher or spiritual nature. It has its foundation in the original and essential capacities of the mind. In proportion as these are unfolded by right and vigorous exertion, it is extended and brightened. In proportion as

these lie dormant, it is obscured. In proportion as they are perverted and overpowered by the appetites and passions, it is blotted out. In truth, moral evil, if unresisted and habitual, may so blight and lay waste these capacities, that the image of God in man may seem to be wholly destroyed.

The importance of this assimilation to our Creator, is a topic, which needs no laboured discussion. All men, of whatever name, or sect, or opinion, will meet me on this ground. All, I presume, will allow, that no good in the compass of the universe, or within the gift of omnipotence, can be compared to a resemblance of God, or to a participation of his attributes. I fear no contradiction here. Likeness to God is the supreme gift. He can communicate nothing so precious, glorious, blessed, as himself. To hold intellectual and moral affinity with the Supreme Being, to partake his spirit, to be his children by derivations of kindred excellence, to bear a growing conformity to the perfection which we adore, this is a felicity which obscures and annihilates all other good.

It is only in proportion to this likeness that we can enjoy either God, or the universe. That God can be known and enjoyed only through sympathy or kindred attributes, is a doctrine which even Gentile philosophy discerned. That the pure in heart can alone see and commune with the pure Divinity, was the sublime instruction of ancient sages, as well as of inspired prophets. It is indeed the lesson of daily experience. To understand a great and good being, we must have seeds of the same excellence. How quickly, by what an instinct, do accordant minds recognise one another! No attraction is so powerful as that which subsists between the truly wise and good; whilst the brightest excellence is lost on those who have nothing congenial in their own breasts. God becomes a real being to us, in proportion as his own nature is unfolded within us. To a man who is growing in the likeness of God, faith begins even here to change into vision. He carries within himself a proof of a Deity, which can only be understood by experience. He more than believes, he feels the divine presence; and gradually rises to an intercourse with his Maker, to which it is not irreverent to apply the name of friendship and intimacy. The apostle John intended to express this truth, when he tells us, that he, in whom a principle of divine charity or benevolence

has become a habit and life, "dwells in God and God in him."

It is plain, too, that likeness to God is the true and only preparation for the enjoyment of the universe. In proportion as we approach and resemble the mind of God, we are brought into harmony with the creation; for, in that proportion we possess the principles from which the universe sprung; we carry within ourselves the perfections, of which its beauty, magnificence, order, benevolent adaptations, and boundless purposes, are the results and manifestations. God unfolds himself in his works to a kindred mind. It is possible, that the brevity of these hints may expose to the charge of mysticism, what seems to me the calmest and clearest truth. I think, however, that every reflecting man will feel, that likeness to God must be a principle of sympathy or accordance with his creation; for the creation is a birth and shining forth of the Divine Mind, a work through which his spirit breathes. In proportion as we receive this spirit, we possess within ourselves the explanation of what we see. We discern more and more of God in every thing, from the frail flower to the everlasting stars. Even in evil, that dark cloud which hangs over the creation, we discern rays of light and hope, and gradually come to see in suffering and temptation, proofs and instruments of the sublimest purposes of wisdom and love.

I have offered these very imperfect views, that I may show the great importance of the doctrine which I am solicitous to enforce. I would teach, that likeness to God is a good so unutterably surpassing all other good, that whoever admits it as attainable, must acknowledge it to be the chief aim of life. I would show, that the highest and happiest office of religion, is to bring the mind into growing accordance with God, and that by the tendency of religious systems to this end, their truth and worth are to be chiefly tried.

I am aware that it may be said, that the Scriptures, in speaking of man as made in the image of God, and in calling us to imitate him, use bold and figurative language. It may be said, that there is danger from too literal an interpretation; that God is an unapproachable being; that I am not warranted in ascribing to man a like nature to the Divine; that we and all things illustrate the Creator by contrast, not by resemblance; that religion manifests itself

chiefly in convictions and acknowledgments of utter worthlessness; and that to talk of the greatness and divinity of the human soul, is to inflate that pride through which Satan fell, and through which man involves himself in that fallen spirit's ruin.

I answer, that, to me, Scripture and reason hold a different language. In Christianity particularly, I meet perpetual testimonies to the divinity of human nature. This whole religion expresses an infinite concern of God for the human soul, and teaches that he deems no methods too expensive for its recovery and exaltation. Christianity, with one voice, calls me to turn my regards and care to the spirit within me, as of more worth than the whole outward world. It calls us to "be perfect as our Father in heaven is perfect;" and everywhere, in the sublimity of its precepts, it implies and recognises the sublime capacities of the being to whom they are addressed. It assures us that human virtue is "in the sight of God of great price," and speaks of the return of a human being to virtue, as an event which increases the joy of heaven. In the New Testament, Jesus Christ, the Son of God, the brightness of his glory, the express and unsullied image of the Divinity, is seen mingling with men as a friend and brother, offering himself as their example, and promising to his true followers a share in all his splendours and joys. In the New Testament, God is said to communicate his own spirit, and all his fulness to the human soul. In the New Testament, man is exhorted to aspire after "honour, glory, and immortality;" and heaven, a word expressing the nearest approach to God, and a divine happiness, is everywhere proposed as the end of his being. In truth, the very essence of Christian faith, is, that we trust in God's mercy, as revealed in Jesus Christ, for a state of celestial purity, in which we shall grow for ever in the likeness, and knowledge, and enjoyment of the Infinite Father. Lofty views of the nature of man, are bound up and interwoven with the whole Christian system. Say not, that these are at war with humility; for who was ever humbler than Jesus, and yet who ever possessed such a consciousness of greatness and divinity? Say not, that man's business is to think of his sin, and not of his dignity; for great sin implies a great capacity; it is the abuse of a noble nature; and no man can be deeply and rationally contrite, but he who feels, that in wrong doing he has resisted a divine voice, and warred against a

divine principle in his own soul. I need not, I trust, pursue the argument from Revelation. There is an argument from nature and reason, which seems to me so convincing, and is, at the same time, so fitted to explain what I mean by man's possession of a like nature to God, that I shall pass at once to its exposition.

That man has a kindred nature with God, and may bear most important and ennobling relations to him, seems to me to be established by a striking proof. This proof you will understand, by considering, for a moment, how we obtain our ideas of God. Whence come the conceptions which we include under that august name? Whence do we derive our knowledge of the attributes and perfections which constitute the Supreme Being? I answer, we derive them from our own souls. The divine attributes are first developed in ourselves, and thence transferred to our Creator. The idea of God, sublime and awful as it is, is the idea of our own spiritual nature, purified and enlarged to infinity. In ourselves are the elements of the Divinity. God, then, does not sustain a figurative resemblance to man. It is the resemblance of a parent to a child, the likeness of a kindred nature.

We call God a Mind. He has revealed himself as a Spirit. But what do we know of mind, but through the unfolding of this principle in our own breasts? That unbounded spiritual energy which we call God, is conceived by us only through consciousness, through the knowledge of ourselves. We ascribe thought or intelligence to the Deity, as one of his most glorious attributes. And what means this language? These terms we have framed to express operations or faculties of our own souls. The Infinite Light would be for ever hidden from us, did not kindred rays dawn and brighten within us. God is another name for human intelligence, raised above all error and imperfection, and extended to all possible truth.

The same is true of God's goodness. How do we understand this but by the principle of love implanted in the human breast? Whence is it, that this divine attribute is so faintly comprehended, but from the feeble developement of it in the multitude of men? Who can understand the strength, purity, fulness, and extent of divine philanthropy, but he in whom selfishness has been swallowed up in love?

The same is true of all the moral perfections of the Deity. These are comprehended by us, only through our

own moral nature. It is conscience within us, which, by its approving and condemning voice, interprets to us God's love of virtue and hatred of sin; and without conscience, these glorious conceptions would never have opened on the mind. It is the lawgiver in our own breasts, which gives us the idea of divine authority, and binds us to obey it. The soul, by its sense of right, or its perception of moral distinctions, is clothed with sovereignty over itself, and through this alone, it understands and recognises the Sovereign of the Universe. Men, as by a natural inspiration, have agreed to speak of conscience as the voice of God—as the Divinity within us. This principle, reverently obeyed, makes us more and more partakers of the moral perfection of the Supreme Being, of that very excellence, which constitutes the rightfulness of his sceptre, and enthrones him over the universe. Without this inward law, we should be as incapable of receiving a law from Heaven, as the brute. Without this, the thunders of Sinai might startle the outward ear, but would have no meaning, no authority to the mind. I have expressed here a great truth. Nothing teaches so encouragingly our relation and resemblance to God; for the glory of the Supreme Being, is eminently moral. We blind ourselves to his chief splendour, if we think only or mainly of his power, and overlook those attributes of rectitude and goodness, to which he subjects his omnipotence, and which are the foundations and very substance of his universal and immutable Law. And are these attributes revealed to us through the principles and convictions of our own souls? Do we understand through sympathy, God's perception of the right, the good, the holy, the just? Then, with what propriety is it said, that in his own image he made man!

I am aware, that it may be objected to these views, that we receive our idea of God from the universe, from his works, and not so exclusively from our own souls. The universe, I know, is full of God. The heavens and earth declare his glory. In other words, the effects and signs of power, wisdom, and goodness, are apparent through the whole creation. But apparent to what? Not to the outward eye; not to the acutest organs of sense; but to a kindred mind, which interprets the universe by itself. It is only through that energy of thought, by which we adapt various and complicated means to distant ends, and give harmony and a common bearing to multiplied exertions,

that we understand the creative intelligence which has established the order, dependencies, and harmony of nature. We see God around us, because he dwells within us. It is by a kindred wisdom, that we discern his wisdom in his works. The brute, with an eye as piercing as ours, looks on the universe; and the page, which to us is radiant with characters of greatness and goodness, is to him a blank. In truth, the beauty and glory of God's works are revealed to the mind by a light beaming from itself. We discern the impress of God's attributes in the universe, by accordance of nature, and enjoy them through sympathy. I hardly need observe, that these remarks in relation to the universe, apply with equal, if not greater force, to revelation.

I shall now be met by another objection, which to many may seem strong. It will be said, that these various attributes of which I have spoken, exist in God in Infinite Perfection, and that this destroys affinity between the human and the divine mind. To this I have two replies. In the first place, an attribute, by becoming perfect, does not part with its essence. Love, wisdom, power, and purity, do not change their nature by enlargement. If they did, we should lose the Supreme Being through his very infinity. Our ideas of him would fade away into mere sounds. For example, if wisdom in God, because unbounded, have no affinity with that attribute in man, why apply to him that term? It must signify nothing. Let me ask what we mean, when we say that we discern the marks of intelligence in the universe? We mean, that we meet there the proofs of a mind like our own. We certainly discern proofs of no other; so that to deny this doctrine, would be to deny the evidences of a God, and utterly to subvert the foundations of religious belief. What man can examine the structure of a plant or an animal, and see the adaptation of its parts to each other and to common ends, and not feel that it is the work of an intelligence akin to his own, and that he traces these marks of design by the same spiritual energy in which they had their origin?

But I would offer another answer to this objection, that God's infinity places him beyond the resemblance and approach of man. I affirm, and I trust that I do not speak too strongly, there are traces of infinity in the human mind, and that in this very respect, it bears a likeness to God. The very conception of infinity, is the mark of a nature to

which no limit can be prescribed. This thought, indeed, comes to us not so much from abroad as from our own souls. We ascribe this attribute to God, because we possess capacities and wants, which only an unbounded being can fill, and because we are conscious of a tendency in spiritual faculties to unlimited expansion. We believe in the divine infinity, through something congenial with it in our own breasts. I hope I speak clearly, and if not, I would ask those to whom I am obscure, to pause before they condemn. To me, it seems that the soul, in all its higher actions, in original thought, in the creations of genius, in the soarings of imagination, in its love of beauty and grandeur, in its aspirations after a pure and unknown joy, and especially in disinterestedness, in the spirit of self-sacrifice, and in enlightened devotion, has a character of infinity. There is often a depth in human love, which may be strictly called unfathomable. There is sometimes a lofty strength in moral principle, which all the power of the outward universe cannot overcome. There seems a might within, which can more than balance all might without. There is, too, a piety, which swells into a transport too vast for utterance, and into an immeasurable joy. I am speaking indeed of what is uncommon, but still of realities. We see, however, the tendency of the soul to the infinite, in more familiar and ordinary forms. Take, for example, the delight which we find in the vast scenes of nature, in prospects which spread around us without limits, in the immensity of the heavens and the ocean, and especially in the rush and roar of mighty winds, waves, and torrents, when, amidst our deep awe, a power within seems to respond to the omnipotence around us. The same principle is seen in the delight ministered to us by works of fiction or of imaginative art, in which our own nature is set before us in more than human beauty and power. In truth, the soul is always bursting its limits. It thirsts continually for wider knowledge. It rushes forward to untried happiness. It has a deep want which nothing limited can appease. Its true element and end, is an unbounded good. Thus, God's infinity has its image in the soul, and through the soul, much more than through the universe, we arrive at this conception of the Deity.

(To be Continued.)

To the Editor of the Christian Pioneer.

Dear Sir,

The Committee of the Unitarian Congregation, Glasgow, respectfully request your insertion of the following account of the late Anniversary Meeting.

I am,

Yours truly,

Robert Hedderwick, Sec.

On Thursday Evening the 8th of January, a number of the Members and Friends of the Unitarian Congregation of this City, drank tea together in the Assembly-Rooms. There were present upwards of one hundred and sixty individuals, male and female. The Hon. D. G. Hallyburton of Pitcur had been requested to preside on the occasion; but, in his unavoidable absence, the Rev. George Harris was called to the chair. The meeting commenced with prayer, and, after tea, a hymn of thanksgiving was sung. Fruits, cakes, and negus, being introduced, the Chairman delivered various introductory remarks adapted to the occasion, congratulating the friends on the altered circumstances in which they now met,—no penal statute, denouncing the punishment of death for their opinions, now hanging over them; and rejoicing in this the largest assemblage that had yet been held in Scotland, devoted to freedom of inquiry, and the promotion of universal charity. Mr. Jenkins, one of the students for the ministry, made some excellent observations on the subject of Civil and Religious Liberty.

Mr. Smeaton then rose, and said, he had been appointed to deliver an Address to their Pastor. He wished that some other person, more able than himself to do justice to the subject, had been chosen, though he was sure no one would feel more pleasure in fulfilling it to the best of his power. Having been chairman at those meetings of the Congregation, when the invitation to Mr. Harris to become their minister, had been unanimously voted, he experienced great satisfaction in the knowledge, that their warmest hopes had been realised. Having been also one of the friends and earliest supporters of Thomas Fyshe Palmer, having witnessed his indefatigable labours, and beheld with admiration that ardent spirit of benevolence by which he was actuated, he rejoiced, that the same cause was now

conducted by one animated by a kindred spirit, possessed with similar zeal, and who, living in happier times, would, he trusted, be blessed in carrying on nearer to its completion, that holy work in which they were all united. Mr. Smeaton then read the following Address, and, during his own remarks and its delivery, was frequently interrupted by loud and fervent applause. On placing the Address and Purse in the hands of Mr. Harris, the whole assembly warmly cheered:—

"Rev. and Dear Sir,

We, the undersigned, Members of the Committee, in the name and on behalf of the Unitarian Congregation of this City, of which you are the honoured and respected Pastor, embrace the opportunity offered by the close of your first engagement with the Society, to present our sincere and grateful thanks for your unwearied labours, and to express our ardent congratulations on the success, which, under the blessing of Providence, has already attended your exertions.

In taking a survey of what has been effected through your instrumentality, we cannot but refer to the discouraging circumstances under which the Congregation previously laboured. To effect a change in the religious sentiments of a people wedded to old institutions and doctrinal peculiarities, by the influence of education, the power of habit, the attractions of interest, the memory of revered ancestors, and the hallowed associations of patriotic struggles, would be, in circumstances however favourable in other respects, an undertaking difficult and laborious, requiring unremitted perseverance, and a steadfast confidence in the righteous issue of the unequal contest. But, when this was to be effected by a small Society, whose motives were suspected, from whom kindred and friends turned away in scorn, at whom the finger of derision was pointed, and the howl of intolerance was raised—oppressed, too, and almost borne down by a burdensome debt, it was no matter of surprise, that prognostications of "empty pews" and "echoing walls" should be uttered, and that public thanksgivings should be offered up, that the Socinian heresy was at its "last gasp." Nor was it to be wondered at, if, counting the fearful odds, the love of some should wax cold, and that some minds, hitherto strong in the faith of the ultimate triumph of truth and righteousness, should almost despair of the apparently ineffectual struggle.

In this situation, we applied to you. We looked with hope to the effect of your labours amongst us; and with gratitude to that Great Being, to vindicate whose character, and to support whose truth, and to promote whose glory, we assemble ourselves together, we acknowledge, with pleasure, that we have not been disappointed. The hope which had nearly deserted us, and the zeal which had been almost palsied, have been relumed and revived amongst us—animating every heart by their cheering and blessed influences. Prejudice, that stumbling-block on the thresh-

old of all improvement—sectarian animosity, that foe to Christian benevolence—bigotry, which is deaf and cannot hear, have manifestly declined in their strength and virulence. Too much of all these odious qualities is still prevalent; but, encouraged by past success, we anticipate, by continued effort, their final subdual. The people not only grant our principles a patient hearing, they throng our chapel, and listen with deep attention to those words of truth and soberness which are there uttered—they not only hear our principles stated, they press forward with eagerness to read the publications in which those principles are enforced and defended; and Scriptural inquiry is evidently gaining an ascendency over tame acquiescence in established and prevailing opinions.

To the extraordinary exertions which you, dear Sir, have made in delivering, every winter, courses of lectures, in addition to the other regular services of the Sabbath, do we mainly attribute this auspicious change. Your fearless advocacy of unpopular truth, your steady and ardent zeal, your strenuous and indefatigable exertions, cannot be witnessed by us without admiration, nor perceived, we think, by others, without justice being done to the motives which prompt your teachings, and a growing conviction being extended, that such disinterested and persevering labours, can only be the result of a firm persuasion of the reasonableness and Scripture authority on which our religious sentiments are founded.

In connection with the evening lectures, we cannot forbear the mention of that excellent plan which originated with yourself, and which, almost unaided, you have carried into execution, of providing for those wishing to judge for themselves, a collection of books, lent out free of expense, which have already been perused by hundreds, and which, we trust, cannot fail of producing beneficial consequences, in the diminution of prejudice and the removal of error.

Nor are these the only services you have rendered to the interests of our particular Society, and to the cause of human improvement generally. The schools which you attempted permanently to establish, and to which you devoted, not merely on the Sundays, but on two evenings during the week, no inconsiderable portion of your time and attention; and which, while they continued, were productive of considerable benefit, and the good effects of which we still perceive, and many gratefully acknowledge;—the formation of a Society, justly denominated "The Benevolent Society," cheering the chamber of sickness, and relieving the necessities of poverty, and binding together by the Christian law of love, the rich and poor of the Congregation;—the publication of "The Christian Pioneer," the organ of our sentiments, the explainer of our principles, and the channel of communication for inquiring minds of all denominations, the clearer away of misrepresentation and obloquy, and the precursor of better views and brighter prospects;—the reduction of that incubus on our former efforts, the debt on the Chapel, which, through your unwearied labours, aided by the generosity of our English brethren, will, we hope, be speedily reduced to at least one-half of its past amount,

thus accomplishing, in this respect, as much as had been effected in the preceding fourteen years;—the attempts made by you to aid the infant Congregations in our neighbourhood, strengthening their hands, and encouraging their comparatively isolated efforts; the kind attention manifested to all of us, whatever may be our relative condition in the world; the labours of friendship, and the instructions of social intercourse, all demand our warmest praise, and have our esteem, respect, and affectionate gratitude.

These labours have not been in vain. The improvement of the congregation both in point of numbers, and respectability of appearance and deportment, the increased call for sittings in the Chapel, and the greater attendance of strangers on our usual services, exhibit the most gratifying results, claiming thankfulness for the past, and reminding us of the necessity of not relaxing our exertions for the future.

Aware of the sacrifices you have made, and of the readiness which on all occasions you evince, to suggest or to promote any plan which may tend to the futherance of the object of our united wishes—the prosperity of our congregation, and the dissemination of the sacred principles of truth and righteousness, we would not bear our testimony to your unwearied labours in words alone. Desirous of showing our gratitude, and affectionate respect and attachment, we beg your acceptance of the accompanying Purse with its contents. We should have rejoiced, had these been more proportioned to your labours, and to the sense we entertain of their worth and their importance. But we are satisfied, you will accept with pleasure, what has been contributed with cheerfulness, and that the motives which prompted our offering, will enhance the value of the gift.

That our continued union may prove a lasting source of comfort and happiness, and of still increasing improvement and usefulness; that it may tend to the diffusion of those views of Christianity which we believe to be in accordance with the teachings of nature, and the feelings of the human heart; and that by their practical influence they may accomplish the object of all religious associations, the awakening man from folly and vice, to righteousness and integrity; and may conduct those who embrace them, to virtue, to happiness, and to heaven, is the sincere and fervent wish of,

REV. AND DEAR SIR,

Your faithful and affectionate Friends."

The Committee regret, that they cannot give the whole of Mr. Harris's speech in reply, nor can they adequately describe the impression it made on the hearers, nor the enthusiastic manner in which it was received; but the following brief report will serve to give an idea of its leading features:—

MY CHRISTIAN FRIENDS,

I should be unworthy both of your respect and of your regard, did I not deeply feel the kindness and friendship which breathe throughout the Address just delivered to me, in

your name, by my esteemed and excellent friend. Believe me, when I say, that I receive it with sincere thankfulness, with honest satisfaction. My heart responds to the expressions of affectionate attachment which it contains, and reciprocates the prayer for Heaven's blessing on you and upon your families, which you have kindly offered for myself. I freely confess, that this is to me a proud, a delightful moment. Had no particular mark of your approval of my past efforts been manifested, had you passed them by as mere matters of course, I trust it would not have stayed me in the onward course of duty; it would not have impeded my labours for the dissemination of what I conceive to be beneficial to man, and honourable to God. The motives which prompt my exertions, have, I hope, a higher aim than man's applause, and are derived from a source more pure than the gratification of earthly passion. Yet, still should I be more or less than man, were I not sensibly to feel a pleasure in the approbation of the virtuous and the enlightened; did I not find my spirit stirred within me by the soul-cheering confidence of those whose highest improvement and everlasting interest it is my duty, as well as happiness to advance; and were I not to acknowledge, that I look upon your testimony to actions performed in the days that are gone, as a claim upon me for continued steadfastness in the contest with error and iniquity, and for renewed and persevering fidelity in that important station to which, by your unanimous suffrage, I have been again appointed. Yes, let others receive the reward of hypocrisy and time-servingness; let them believe one thing and profess another, and worldly splendour be the remuneration for their shame; let the priest flaunt in his robes, and the prelate be crowned with the mitre—I thank God, that I can afford to keep a conscience; and, give me the hearts of a free people, and let my freehold of rejoicing be, that I possess the unshackled privilege of the unreserved communication of my thoughts to a Congregation anxious for the knowledge of God's law, and desirous of further and increasing light, and exhibiting in their lives, the righteous and holy fruits of improved and improving understandings; and I envy not a single living creature, however high may be his place in the ranks of bigotry and intolerance; however splendid may be his station, or however lordly may be his title.

I would not, however, allow personal considerations to interfere with the higher and more sacred pleasure I have experienced in your Address, inasmuch as it evinces your devotedness to those benevolent and sanctifying principles, which it is our united object to diffuse. The honour you have paid to the instrument of their dissemination, is to me a pledge of your gratitude for having been led to their reception, of your thankfulness to that Being, whom now you no longer approach with the terrors of the bondman, but adore with the feelings with which children should glorify their benignant Father. In praising the defender of those doctrines which vindicate the stainless purity of the Author of our being, you bear your testimony to their blessed power, their moral efficacy; and you thereby engage, not merely that my crowning reward shall be witnessed in your righteous conduct

but that on the altar of Christian philanthropy, you will offer up those labours which honour God by promoting the happiness and dignity of man. Your address is, in truth, the banding of yourselves together against the world's prejudices and the world's idolatry—it is a solemn league and covenant with truth and virtue; and I receive the highest, the best, the purest recompense for all my labours, when their effect is thus evidenced, by your adherence to reason rather than tradition, when you prefer the Bible to human Confessions, choose truth before worldly estimation, regard those as brethren who look on you as aliens, follow the Saviour rather than earthborn hierarchies, and value every blessing the more highly as it binds you in adoring gratitude to creation's all-bounteous Parent!

You have forcibly stated the difficulties which bar the progress of Christian Reformation in the land in which we dwell. Our situation is indeed peculiar. Whilst the varying sects by which we are surrounded, scarcely differ, but in name, from the holy Mother of Christendom, we are Protestants indeed and in truth. We are Protestants, not alone against her corruptions, and her mental thraldom, and her unmeaning formularies, but also are we Protestants with regard even to Protestants themselves. Having entered into the liberty of the children of God, we subscribe not *slave*, to any church or community of believers; we reverence our reason as the gift of our Father, and joy in Revelation as in heaven's crowning mercy. The Bible, the Bible only, contains our religion, and that teaches us to look on man as our brother, and with reverence and affection to God, as to that ever present friend, whose loveliest name is Love. Believing that the fountain of wisdom and intelligence, may have stores of knowledge yet in reserve for his children, our heart's desire and prayer is, that error may be banished, and truth prevail, though all the systems of man's adoption, and our own among the number, may be proved to have imperfection mingled with their purity, and ignorance and prejudice blended with their benevolence. Light, from whatever quarter it may proceed, we long for, and therefore is it, that we value free and fearless inquiry, as the precursor of human improvement, and the harbinger of moral perfection.

It would be surprising, certainly, that such sentiments should meet with direst opposition, had we not experienced in our own persons, the powerful associations which bind down the mind to popular prepossessions, even when the heart rises up in righteous rebellion against their gloominess. We know how our feelings cling to the faith of our forefathers, even at the very time those feelings are outraged by its repugnance to reason and humanity. And when these feelings, of almost religious veneration, are united with those of national deliverance, when nearly every man in Scotland is taught to look back with exultation to that period, when his ancestors trod the heather in defiance of black Prelacy, and in despite of a Monarch's haughty mandates, poured forth in her mountain solitudes their prayer to that God, whom they loved to obey rather than man,—it is not to be wondered at, that amidst the admiration called forth by the deeds of their venerated

forefathers, the wisdom of that line is not all at once apparent to their minds, that "New Presbyter is but Old Priest writ large." Poetry and prose have likewise contributed to maintain and diffuse these feelings. The songs which our fathers loved, are among the most cherished recollections of their descendants, and the charm, too, which the mighty enchanter of this country has cast around the scenes, in which "Scotia's persecuted children foiled a Tyrant's and a Bigot's bloody laws," is, I am persuaded, the secret spell which binds many to the profession of the popular Creed, whose understandings, could they once be excited to inquiry, would speedily burst their trammels. The calumny and vituperation so incessantly poured out against the heresy of our worship and belief—the "serious and settled abhorrence" expressed against Socinianism, which after all, is only as they depict it, the monstrous fiction of a prejudiced understanding—the various engagements and testimonies under which men come, to uproot that, so called, pernicious and fatal doctrine—and the penalties, even unto the death, which attached to our sentiments till the year 1813,—these, combined with that fear of man, which always bringeth with it a snare to consistency, and a trap for conscience, the wish to avoid family divisions, and the desire to form family connexions, the power of fashion, the current of custom, the hope of standing well with the world, and of enjoying its smiles, and offices, and dignities, and emoluments, marshal a fearful array against the progress of despised and unpopular truth, and go far to account, I think, for what to some might otherwise seem to be our day of small things. But legislative authority has removed from the timid, one of the barriers to an open profession of our principles, though, even before that removal, there were spirits who disdained compliance with man's enactments, when opposed to God's commands; and even your Chapel was built and opened, yes, I rejoice in the remembrance, when you worshipped your God, like the Apostle, contrary to the law. Nor can we doubt, that if ours be the truth, all the other obstacles will share a similar fate, moral honesty become a more distinguishing characteristic of the people, and that thousands of grateful hearts, in obedience to the precepts, and in imitation of the example of the Saviour, will adore in spirit and in truth, the supreme Father—the only and ever living God.

Our past progress is, I trust, a presage of future success. Taking the Unitarian census printed by our leading opponent in this City, as the correct estimate of our numbers when I became your Pastor, let it be known, that as many individuals as at that time constituted the Society, have since removed to England, Ireland, America, and to various towns in Scotland; that more than that number have been called to the silent tomb; that the love of others, to an almost equal amount, has, from a variety of combining influences, waxed cold; but that still we have remaining with us, as fellow-worshippers and brethren, from four to five times the number of individual members we then had. Nor is it alone in the numbers of those who have joined our Congregation, that we

would rejoice. There is a different spirit abroad from what was wont. Respect has succeeded contempt, and confidence taken the place of suspicion. No tradesman now, I apprehend, would refuse to sell his wares because they were to be paid for in Unitarian money; nor could any Church in this City, I conceive, be now found to refuse baptism to a child because its father had worked at the Unitarian Chapel. People have learned that Unitarian money is tolerably sterling, and that the man who earns his bread by the sweat of his brow, is not therefore to be deprived of his spiritual privileges. The community will listen to our statements, though they may not embrace our conclusions; they do not insult our worship, though they may not believe our principles; and instead of the empty pews which used to be so visible at the conclusion of an evening lecture, those who once came to scoff now remain to pray. Who can fail to revert, with satisfaction, to past years, when such is the result? Who is not warranted in looking forward with confidence, if zeal and perseverance and union be ours, to the future triumphs of the faith we love? Yes, we will thank God and take courage.

I have slightly alluded to the number of those who have been taken from us to the grave. For our comparatively small Society, death's conquests have indeed been mighty. Not less than sixty individuals connected with us, have, during the last three years, paid the debt of nature. And when we cast our views back to the origin of our Congregation, and to the commencement of the preaching of our doctrines in Scotland—when we observe how many places are empty of those whom once we knew, and in whose friendship and labours we rejoiced, while our principles forbid us to sorrow as those who have no hope, yet does there a feeling of melancholy mingle with our pleasure, though at the same time we are reminded by the solemn fact, that indefatigable and increased exertion is demanded at our hands. Could they have lived to witness the firm establishment of the Congregation, and beheld the progress of that cause they were so anxious to promote—could they have been spared to partake with us in this evening's rational and heartfelt enjoyment, how would their spirits have been cheered, their labours recompensed! But, thank God, they have laboured, and we have entered into their labours. Fragrant as Sharon's rose, the remembrance of their virtues is sweet even in death. Yes, they have done more for our cause than we have. They served it faithfully in life, and it made their deaths blessed. You know the common calumny upon that subject. You know it is said, that Unitarianism may "do to live with, but not to die with." Oh, they know nothing of its sacred influence who thus speak respecting it——.

Here, the Committee are truly sorry, their Report is very inefficient. The deep silence which, at this period, pervaded the room—the glistening eyes which showed how deeply the hearts of the auditors sympathized in the deathbed scenes which the Speaker was portraying, testified to the truth of the description. Mr. Harris then concluded this portion of his Reply:

My Christian Friends, can I frame a better or a purer wish, either for you or for myself, than that our lives may be thus useful, benevolent, and holy, in order that our deaths may be thus happy.

Accept, my Christian Friends, my sincere and grateful acknowledgments, for the very handsome present which accompanies your Address. Those kind friends who ornamented the Address, and prepared the Purse, will also, I hope, accept my thanks. Their labour will not be thrown away, for, persuaded am I, that false hearts have not prompted it, nor false hands performed it. It will counsel me never to despair of the triumph of truth; it will remind me, that the long-cherished feelings and prejudices of youth and of maturity, may yield, even in more advanced life, to the power of Scriptural knowledge. I value the gift, my friends, both for your sakes and my own. Republics, it has been said, are always ungrateful; the people, it is affirmed, too usually, while reaping the benefit of public labours, neglect the labourer. But, if these be the rules, you have proved, and nobly proved, that, like most other rules, they have their exception too. I value the gift, because it is not made up of a donation from the Secret Service Money, nor does it constitute a portion of the Regium Donum—did it so, rather would these hands minister to my necessities, than accept that, which, in such a case, I could only regard as the price of political subserviency, or the reward of religious truckling. I value the gift, because no tithe-proctor has filled that purse—no half-famished family have been forced, by sacerdotal minions, to yield up their hard earnings at the command of priestly cupidity. No: such a contribution would have disgraced me, and dishonoured you. But I do receive with pleasure, what you affirm to have been given with cheerfulness; and I value the gift the more highly, because I believe it to be a free-will offering.

The station which, in the course of God's providence, you have been called to occupy, is most important. You have to stand between the dead and the living, that the plague may be stayed,—the plague of creed idolatry, of intolerant judgments, of sectarian animosity. No trifling responsibility is yours. On you, the eyes of enemies, as well as of friends, are fixed. The estimation in which our doctrines shall be held, and the progress which they are destined to make in this city, in this country, depends mainly upon you. To your keeping is confided, not the affairs of your own congregation merely, but the cause of uncorrupted Christianity, of mental freedom, of individual happiness, and national improvement. Your unswerving principle, your righteous deportment, your benevolent practice, your religious integrity, your devotedness to the welfare of human society, your pious aspirations to heaven's King, these, your good works, will cause even opponents to marvel, and it may be, lead them to inquiry, and not improbably, ultimately to unite with you in the sacred worship of the universal Father. At any rate, if they embrace not your doctrines, they will admire your conduct, there will at least be, if not a unity of opinion, yet a communion of hearts. But if you fail——

The baseness of deserting the post of duty, of conformity to the world, of lukewarmness, of indifferentism, of immorality, was depicted in glowing colours. Earnestly do the Committee hope, that neither from their own minds, nor from those of their friends, may those powerful exhortations ever be effaced.

——God forbid that such degradation should be yours. I cannot, will not think it, though I thus utter the voice of warning. Rather would I indulge my imagination in those cheering visions of futurity, when through your instrumentality, and that of others who are like-minded, knowledge shall run to and fro, and be increased, the Temple of Truth be thronged with votaries, and the jubilee of the creation be at hand. No matter whether we live or not, to partake that blessedness; no matter that that sun of glory may shine upon our graves; enough for us, if our children's children shall rejoice in its sacred effulgence; enough for us, if, in consequence of the seed we are sowing, the golden harvest of truth and righteousness wave for our descendants; enough for us, if, as the effect of our strenuous and united efforts, they, whilst enjoying its fruits, and its purity and loveliness, shall revert with reverential affection to our characters—shall laud our actions, and hold our memories in hallowed remembrance.

Various sentiments connected with the interests of the Congregation, the progress of knowledge, the prevalence of liberty, the cause of uncorrupted Christianity, Catholic Emancipation, and the diffusion of Christian charity, were proposed in the course of the evening, and were enforced and illustrated by the Chairman, and Messrs. Bryson, Hedderwick, Wicksteed, J. Hedderwick, Junior, Rowe, Calder of Davies Dykes, Evans, and R. Hedderwick. The following lines, from one of the periodicals, was introduced, as accurately descriptive of the opposition made to the progress of freedom of thought, and especially of the abrogation of the penal statutes, on subjects connected with religion:

See those cherries, how they cover
  Yonder sunny garden wall,
Had they not that net-work over,
  Thieving birds would eat them all.

So, to guard our posts and pensions,
  Ancient sages wove a net,
Through whose holes of small dimensions,
  Only certain knaves can get.

Shall we, then, this net-work widen?
  Shall we stretch these sacred holes,
Through which, e'en already, slide in
  Lots of small dissenting souls?

Heaven forbid! old Testy crieth;
Heaven forbid! so echo I;
Every ravenous bird that flieth,
Then would at ouf cherries fly!

Ope but half an inch or so,
And behold, what bevies break in;
Here, some cursed old Popish crow,
Pops his long and lickerish beak in!

There, sly Arians flock unnumber'd,
And Socinians, slim and spare,
Who, with small belief encumber'd,
Slip in easy, any where!

Methodists, of birds the aptest,
Where there's picking going on;
And that water-fowl, the Baptist,
All would share our fruits anon!

Every bird, of every city,
That for years, with ceaseless din,
Hath reversed the starling's ditty,
Singing out, "I can't get in!"

If less costly fruit won't suit them,
Hips and haws, and such like berries—
Curse the cormorants, stone them, shoot them,
Any thing—to save our cherries!

The whole evening was passed in a truly rational and delightful manner, and was closed about eleven o'clock, by singing a hymn, by prayer, and benediction.

THE CHRISTIAN PIONEER.

GLASGOW, *January* 31, 1829.

THE Fourth Anniversary of the opening of the Unitarian Meeting-House, Salford, Manchester, was celebrated on Sunday and Monday, the 28th and 29th December. The religious services were conducted by the Rev. Henry Montgomery, the enlightened and eloquent advocate of mental freedom and scriptural inquiry, whose powerful pleadings for untrammelled conscience before the Synod of Ulster, have often adorned our pages. The Sunday morning worship was conducted at the Meeting-House, Salford. The evening sermon was preached in Cross-Street Chapel, Manchester. This spacious House of Prayer was crowded; and for upwards of an hour and a half, was the attention of a delighted audience rivetted by

the splendid and Christian exhortations of the preacher. The sermon on Monday morning, was delivered at the Salford Meeting-House. The subject was, the importance of education—of Christian education; and happy are we to be able to announce, that it will form a portion of the Volume of Sermons for family worship, speedily to be published. The collections at the various services, towards the liquidation of the debt on the Salford place of Worship, amounted to £79.

The Anniversary Dinner was held in the School-Room belonging to the Meeting-House. About one hundred and eighty gentlemen were present; Richard Collins, Esq. in the Chair. The meeting was addressed by the Revds. Robberds, Tayler, W. Gaskell, and Beard, Sir Richard Phillips, &c. On "Catholic Emancipation" being proposed by Mr. Richard Potter, and a general call being made for Mr. Montgomery, that gentleman, after a few introductory remarks, thus proceeded:—

The people of Ireland, he would venture to affirm, were a people by nature as well-disposed, as kindly affectioned, as any people on the face of the earth. How completely perverted, then, must be that state of things, which could efface and obliterate, in the bosoms of such a people, the finest lineaments of the human character, and present the melancholy picture of dark and jarring passions, which that country now exhibited. Even religion was there perverted into a sword of persecution, a source of hatred and contention, the divisions of the country reversed the command of God to love their neighbours; and *he* seemed to be thought to manifest the highest love of God, who distinguished himself by hatred of his brother. Yes, he grieved to say, that it was an almost universal feeling, that what was called orthodoxy in religion, was necessarily connected with hostility to the common rights of man. He was bound to observe, that there were many and honourable exceptions among the Calvinists, for it was they who assumed peculiarly the merit of orthodoxy. He was happy in knowing many individuals of that particular doctrine, who were as ardently attached, as any of the gentlemen who heard him, to the cause of religious liberty; but still the general sentiment was what he had stated it to be. And what were to be the ultimate consequences to Ireland? The two strongest impulses of the human mind were put in motion; the passions of the people were roused by all the considerations that were involved in time and eternity; and they were assailed by the double persecution of religious bigotry and political intolerance.

The consequence was, that their peasantry was so wrought upon, that it was now usual, and he related it with horror, for them to meet at their fairs and markets with daggers and pistols, concealed in those breasts that ought only to contain kind sym-

pathies and generous hearts. Protestants, who were allowed to have arms, openly wore them, and insulted the Catholics, who had them not; and the consequence was, that deadly feuds and the most fatal frays ensued. He had not yet related the worst: some of the leading agitators, not many he rejoiced to say, but some were ministers of religion, and one clergyman, as they were aware, had gone so far as to say, in anticipation of a renewal of civil conflict, that he trusted, on the next occasion, they should not be left the alternative of Connaught. They did not understand, perhaps, the import of this phrase, and he would therefore explain it to them. At an unfortunate era in the history of their unfortunate country—when the Catholics were driven out of some of the counties in the north of Ireland, when their property was destroyed and their houses burned, by the fanaticism and bigotry of their neighbours—it was a common cry, "to Hell or Connaught!" and the clergyman whom he had mentioned, meant, by this allusion, that they were not to be allowed the alternative of Connaught; they were to have no shelter but in hell! The language was applied to the whole Catholic population of Ireland; it was not to its grossness or to its bigotry, that he called attention, but to the horrible inhumanity of a proposal, that thus proceeded from the lips of a minister of the gospel of peace, for the total extirpation of five millions of people! This man, who was living in luxury by the sweat of the brow of the starving wretched people of Ireland, trusted, that, in the next commotion, out of five millions of people, there would not be as many left as would require a second correction.

The established clergy, he was sorry to say, were the chief promoters of Brunswick clubs, and the chief spouters at their meetings, the chief instigators of the oppression and coercion of the people. But this was not the universal character of the clergy of the Established Church, among whom there were many, and some whom he had the happiness of knowing, who were the steady friends of civil and religious liberty. It was impossible to conceive how a country, managed as Ireland had been for centuries, could be happy. All possible modes of coercion, the scaffold, the gaol, exile, had been tried; still the people were not contented. Something, however, might at last be done; for the people themselves were beginning to believe that a little law, a little liberty, and a little justice, would have a happier effect than coercion; perhaps the experiment would be tried; and as it was quite new, it might succeed. He really was surprised, that in all the expedients that had been resorted to, the government had never, by any accident, deviated into the path of common justice, and common humanity. He would venture to assert, that if it were at last tried, Ireland would be one of the most cheerful, happy, and prosperous countries in the world. She was blessed with a soil of more than ordinary fertility; a mild climate, with kind hearts and generous hands; a people who would be grateful even for justice. That the Catholics were degraded, he admitted (he spoke of the lower ranks); it would be strange, indeed, if the pains which had been taken to degrade them, had had no effect;

but where you treated them with conciliation and kindness, you were sure to meet a rich harvest of gratitude. Nothing could be easier than for a British Statesman to secure himself such a harvest. His Majesty's visit had been regarded as an omen of peace; and he had then an opportunity of judging of the feelings which kindness would elicit from the Irish people. Those were halcyon days; he was sorry that their hopes had been so soon disappointed. They had heard it reported, that the Royal breast had been changed; he did not wish to believe it. The essence of the British Constitution was, that all the subjects of the British monarch had equal rights; and if George the Fourth was a truly British monarch, he would be anxious to give them; he held that it was a libel on the king to say, that he was unfriendly to the civil rights of any portion of his people; and he trusted, that we should, ere long, see it refuted by his sign manual to a bill for the Emancipation of the Catholics. The Duke of Wellington had recently told them, that there were difficulties in the way, and that these difficulties were very great. He could not, however, believe, that they were perfectly insurmountable. The chief difficulty was the Protestant Ascendancy; but was this any difficulty in the way of men, who were determined to do as they would be done by? Was it a difficulty for a Christian nation to do an act of justice? Impossible. Perhaps in the very next Session of Parliament, the Bishops might free the Duke of Wellington from all these difficulties; they would tell the Lords that no temporary considerations should prevail against the immutable principles of justice and equity; and it was to be hoped, that when my Lords Eldon and Winchelsea heard these admirable Christian sentiments from the consecrated guardians of the Christian faith, they would acknowledge that their zeal had been too warm, and join in removing the scruples of their followers in the House; for it was there, in the seat of hereditary wisdom, that they had the chief obstacles to apprehend. The Bishops would tell them, that the measure was one by which the Protestant interest could not possibly be endangered, if by Protestant interest they meant the interests of the Protestant religion; and that if dangers might accrue from it to the Protestant Establishment, their kingdom was not of this world, and such considerations had nothing to do with religion. For his part, he could not see how concession could trench on the integrity of the Protestant religion. Nay, these gentlemen must be aware, that, by the continuance of these restrictions, they obstructed the progress of Protestantism. How was it possible, he would ask, that the Catholic, suffering from generation to generation under the Church, supporting it, and deriving no benefit from it, should love that Church; could he believe that the Church was interested about his salvation, that denied him the rights of a man? He held, that the way to advance the Protestant religion, was to remove the Catholic disabilities. There were a great many societies who had been engaged in the work of converting the Catholics; but they had only rivetted the chains which they pretended to break. And why was this—why had they not succeeded? Because almost every man who had distinguished himself

in the attempt, was an enemy to the civil rights of the Catholics. No, the Catholics said, you pretend that your object is to save my soul, and confer an everlasting benefit upon me—that may be; your professions are large, but the accomplishment of them is doubtful, but as an earnest of your good-will, will you grant those civil rights which will be of great and immediate service to me here? No, is the reply, you are unworthy to receive such a boon; I will not give you the rights of a freeman, but I will give you salvation! Precisely such was the language which the conduct of our converters spoke to the Catholics. They asked for bread, and they gave them a stone; they asked for a fish, and they gave them a serpent. Men could not be converted, unless they were fairly treated.

If he were about to make a convert, and were to commence by tying him neck and heels upon the floor, the subject of his polemics would not feel himself in a very comfortable situation; he would say, I am perfectly able to argue with you, but do not feel disposed for argument in my present situation; have the kindness to remove these cords. If I refuse: if I tell him plainly, that he shall not be unbound till he is converted, that he must emancipate himself, I may talk over him to eternity, without producing any impression. But if I assent to the fairness of the proposition; if I place him on an equal footing—if we stand on the ground of our common humanity, my arguments will have a fair chance; a man not wronged can scarcely look fairly in the face of his fellow man without being moved with some sympathy for him; no hostile feeling steels the mind against conviction; and I thus may make a convert of a man by kindness, where, by a contrary treatment, I should have hardened him in error. There can be no conversion till there is justice; if this were conceded, the Catholics might then in time merge in the Protestant churches. He should delight to see them so merged; he did not, he could not approve their religious tenets; he wished to see them converted, but the first step to their conversion must be to grant them their civil rights. This question impeded every attempt at improvement. If any thing could be calculated to rub off the asperities of feeling that had been contracted, it would be mingling the opposed communities together in childhood; but by the present state of things, the Catholic children were driven into separate schools, and from the cradle to the grave, they were brought up and lived in a state of alienation from their fellow-subjects. They were not even allowed to consign the remains of their friends to the grave of a Protestant burial-ground, without submitting to the humiliation of asking permission to offer, beside that grave, their prayers to their Maker. Distinctions must be preserved even beyond the tomb, and their very bones must not be allowed to be in juxta position with those of Protestants. Was it any wonder that the country was wretched? It was now objected to the Roman Catholics, that they were violent in demanding concession. They had tried supplication, and they had tried it in vain; at last they had begun to think, that there could be no very substantial reason for their suing, *in forma pauperis*, for their civil rights. They had assumed a bolder stand, and he honoured them

for it. He, perhaps, could not justify every particular act, or every phrase, that had fallen from them; but these were the ebullitions of the feelings of nature rising up against injustice. Were he, as an individual, excluded, he would be as violent, more violent, than any member of the Catholic Association. Such violence, such energy, he held in honour—the man who would not struggle for his rights, did not deserve to attain them. It was said too, by some, that the body of Catholics felt no interest in the question; it might be that many did not; and if this were the case, it was another reason for extending to them their rights; if any Catholic were so degraded as to feel indifferent at being debarred from his rights as a citizen, it was necessary to elevate him to a proper sense of his dignity, by conferring those rights.

These liberal and Christian sentiments were warmly applauded, as was also a preceding Address made by Mr. Montgomery, on his own health being proposed. The meeting was a mental feast. We are glad that such meetings continue to be held; we hope and are persuaded they will increase, for we fully and cordially unite in the feelings expressed by Mr. Potter, at this Anniversary. May his health be completely restored, and long may his valuable life be spared to enjoy the pleasure of doing good:

"For my part," said Mr. Potter, "I like not the cold and heartless proceeding, of meeting my fellow-worshippers in the same temple, week after week, year after year, allowing all further intercourse to cease when they separated; meetings like this, round the social board, make us better acquainted with each other, expand our hearts, and induce us to be more willing to assist and advise our fellow-creatures in many ways where advice and assistance would be highly serviceable, and, above all, by exciting the delightful feelings of sympathy."

Catholic Liberality, Episcopalian Benevolence, Presbyterian Intolerance, Methodist Bigotry.

THE Duke of Norfolk has in his service a female who is a Methodist. Some time since, one of the upper servants at Arundel, complained to his Grace that this woman was over religious, and lost much valuable time in attending her Chapel. The Duke asked where she went to, and was answered. "What!" said he, "a woman walk four miles to a place of worship? it is too far. I desire that in future the boy may drive her every Sunday in the gig. She is right in worshipping the Almighty where and how she thinks best."

IT has been the custom of the Duke of Northumberland, about the close of the year, to address letters to the Clergyman and Dissenting Ministers of Alnwick, requesting them to point out

30 individuals in their respective Congregations, who were in need of a supply of clothing, food, &c. The Unitarian Minister alone formed an exception. But since the settlement of the Rev. John Wright with the Unitarian Congregation of that town, a similar missive of benevolence has been transmitted to him, and the same number of individuals in the Unitarian Society, have experienced the bounty of his Grace, as of the other denominations in Alnwick. We regard this circumstance as another proof of the progress of Christian liberality; an additional evidence, too, that zealous exertions in the dissemination of a particular faith, and strenuous labours in opposition to established error, will meet with respect even from those who deem those labours and exertions to be called forth by mistaken and antiscriptural opinions.

THE Presbytery of Glasgow has again arrayed itself on the side of intolerance. At the last meeting, an overwhelming majority decided on petitioning against the emancipation of the Catholics. Four individuals alone were heard raising their voices in favour of Christian freedom; and the treatment they experienced from certain of the majority, was any thing but what might be looked for from professing Christian ministers. That the adherents of a Church which extorts millions from a suffering and impoverished people—that those who riot on tithes, forced from parishes where there is neither church nor congregation, no, not even a "dearly beloved Roger," to utter a response to the faithful pastor—that such persons should stand in the way of Christian charity, and oppose their brethren's participation of the common rights of man, is not a whit surprising. The "yellow slave which knits and breaks religion," is the lion in the path. But, that descendants of men whom Episcopacy persecuted even unto the death, should join with those who look on their unstalled theology with contempt, and regard every thing Presbyterian as synonymous with meanness, would be passing strange, did not history assure us that all established churches are founded on intolerance, and did not Confessions and Covenants confirm the melancholy fact.

THE Methodists in some parts of England, have been labouring in their vocation, joining in the howl of "No Popery!" At the Leeds meeting, one of their Preachers made himself tolerably conspicuous; and in Cornwall, a Mr. Wade, apprehensive that some of his flock might by the eloquent, and, as we think, unanswerable speeches of the friends of religious liberty, at a meeting of the freeholders of Callington, be induced to act as became Englishmen and Christians, launched, at the rising spirit of liberty in their breasts, this formidable bolt of JOHN WESLEY:—"That in consequence of the idolatrous worship of Papists, their power of absolving from the consequences of all oaths made with heretics, and other immoral and dangerous doctrines of the Romish Church, they were to be regarded in a worse light than even infidels, who denied all revealed religion, and therefore ought not to be even tolerated in any Christian, Pagan, or Mahometan country." The authority of the Rev. John Wesley, the Rev. Mr. Wade affirmed,

the Methodists "were in a great measure bound to submit to." We know it, and yet these are the people to harangue against the tyranny of Popery. Whilst bowing beneath a yoke, almost if not quite as grievous as that of his Catholic brother, the Methodist opposes his claim to the possession of civil rights, because in his religious faith he defers to the authority of his Priest and the Roman Pontiff. But if the Methodist is not, on the subject of Religious Liberty, to exercise his own judgment, but is called on by *his* Priest to obey the dictate of John Wesley, though opposed to his better feelings, where is the mighty difference between the parties? The Protestant Pope must be attended to; or else the Protestant Inquisition—the Conference, is at hand to enforce compliance; and woe to that unfortunate wight, who falls into hands whose tender mercies are cruel! We are glad to see, however, that Christian liberty has penetrated even into the Methodistic fold, and that in some places in Lancashire, though exhorted and threatened by their preachers to sign petitions against Catholic Emancipation, the people have resisted. They have imbibed, and we trust, will still more consistently act up to the principle thus expressed by an eloquent disciple of the Saviour: "I am a Protestant, and it is the principle of Protestanism to judge for itself. I am a Christian, and it is the privilege of Christians to worship God according to one's own conscience. I have yet to learn, that it is the duty of a Christian to oppress his fellow-Christians. I know of no principle of humanity which obliges me to crush a whole population. I am ignorant of any doctrine which obliges us to break faith with Catholics, lest, perchance, Catholics might break faith with us."

From Manchester, Mr. Montgomery proceeded to London, and preached, we believe, on the first Sunday of the New-Year, in the morning at the Chapel in Jewin-Street, and in the evening at Carter-Lane. On Monday, the 5th January, a dinner, in testimony of respect for his distinguished labours for religious freedom, was given, in honour of Mr. Montgomery, at which W. Sturch, Esq. presided, and which was attended by upwards of one hundred individuals of various denominations, Catholic and Protestant.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

Dialogues on Religion, No. 2; Letters from Port-Glasgow; various Publications for Review, &c. have been received, and will be inserted and noticed in the next Number. Our friends will accept our thanks for Newspapers from Maidstone, Birmingham, and Manchester.

THE

CHRISTIAN PIONEER.

No. 31. March, 1829. Vol. III.

Dr. Channing's Discourse in Providence, Rhode Island.

(Continued from page 202.)

In these remarks I have spoken strongly. But I have no fear of expressing too strongly, the connection between the divine and the human mind. My only fear is, that I shall dishonour the great subject. The danger to which we are most exposed, is that of severing the Creator from his creatures. The propensity of human sovereigns to cut off communication between themselves and their subjects, and to disclaim a common nature with their inferiors, has led the multitude of men, who think of God chiefly under the character of a king, to conceive of him as a being, who places his glory in multiplying distinctions between himself and all other beings. The truth is, that the union between the Creator and the creature, surpasses all other bonds in strength and intimacy. He penetrates all things, and delights to irradiate all with his glory. Nature, in its lowest and inanimate forms, is pervaded by his power; and when quickened by the mysterious property of life, how wonderfully does it show forth the perfections of its author! How much of God may be seen in the structure of a single leaf, which, though so frail as to tremble in every wind, yet holds connections and living communications with the earth, the air, the clouds, and the distant sun; and, through these sympathies with the universe, is itself a revelation of an omnipotent mind. God delights to diffuse himself everywhere. Through his energy, unconscious matter clothes itself with proportions, powers, and beauties which reflect his wisdom and love. How much more must he delight to frame conscious and happy recipients of his perfections, in whom his wisdom and love may substantially dwell, with whom he may form spiritual ties, and to whom he may be an everlasting spring of moral energy and happiness. How far the Supreme Being may communicate his attributes to his intelligent offspring, I stop not to inquire. But that his almighty goodness will impart to them powers and glories, of which

the material universe is but a faint emblem, I cannot doubt. That the soul, if true to itself and its Maker, will be filled with God, and will manifest him, more than that sun, I cannot doubt. Who can doubt it, that believes and understands the doctrine of human immortality?

The views which I have given in this discourse, respecting man's participation of the divine nature, seem to me to receive strong confirmation, from the title or relation most frequently applied to God in the New Testament; and I have reserved this as the last corroboration of this doctrine, because, to my own mind, it is singularly affecting. In the New Testament, God is made known to us as a Father, and a brighter feature of that book cannot be named. Our worship is to be directed to him as our Father. Our whole religion is to take its character from this view of the Divinity. In this he is to rise always to our minds. And what is it to be a Father? It is to communicate one's own nature, to give life to kindred beings; and the highest function of a Father, is to educate the mind of the child, and to impart to it what is noblest and happiest in his own mind. God is our Father, not merely because he created us, or because he gives us enjoyment; for he created the flower and the insect, yet we call him not their Father. This bond is a spiritual one. This name belongs to God, because he frames spirits like himself, and delights to give them what is most glorious and blessed in his own nature. Accordingly, Christianity is said, with special propriety, to reveal God as the Father, because it reveals him, as sending his Son to cleanse the mind from every stain, and to replenish it for ever with the spirit and moral attributes of its Author. Separate from God this idea of his creating and training up beings after his own likeness, and you rob him of the paternal character. This relation vanishes, and with it, vanish the glory of the gospel, and the dearest hopes of the human soul.

The great use which I would make of the principles laid down in this discourse, is, to derive from them just and clear views of the nature of religion. What, then, is religion? I answer, it is not the adoration of a God, with whom we have no common properties—of a distinct, foreign, separate being, but of an all-communicating Parent. It recognises and adores God as a being, whom we know through our own souls; who has made man in

his own image; who is the perfection of our own spiritual nature; who has sympathies with us as kindred beings; who is near us, not in place only like this all-surrounding atmosphere, but by spiritual influence and love; who looks on us with parental interest; and whose great design it is to communicate to us for ever, and in freer and fuller streams, his own power, goodness, and joy. The conviction of this near and ennobling relation of God to the soul, and of his great purposes towards it, belongs to the very essence of true religion; and true religion manifests itself chiefly and most conspicuously in desires, hopes, and efforts, corresponding to this truth. It desires and seeks supremely the assimilation of the mind to God, or the perpetual unfolding and enlargement of those powers and virtues, by which it is constituted his glorious image. The mind, in proportion as it is enlightened and penetrated by true religion, thirsts and labours for a godlike elevation. What else indeed can it seek, if this good be placed within its reach? If I am capable of receiving and reflecting the intellectual and moral glory of my Creator, what else in comparison shall I desire? Shall I deem a property in the outward universe as the highest good, when I may become partaker of the very mind from which it springs, of the prompting love, the disposing wisdom, the quickening power, through which its order, beauty, and beneficent influences subsist? True religion is known by these high aspirations, hopes, and efforts. And this is the religion which most truly honours God. To honour him, is not to tremble before him as an unapproachable sovereign, nor to utter barren praise, which leaves us as it found us. It is to become what we praise. It is to approach God as an inexhaustible Fountain of light, power, and purity. It is to feel the quickening and transforming energy of his perfections. It is to thirst for the growth and invigoration of the divine principle within us. It is to seek the very spirit of God. It is to trust in, to bless, to thank him, for that rich grace, mercy, love, which was revealed and proffered by Jesus Christ, and which proposes as its great end, the perfection of the human soul.

I regard this view of religion as infinitely important. It does more than all things to make our connection with our Creator ennobling and happy; and in proportion as we want it, there is danger that the thought of God may itself become the instrument of our degradation. That

religion has been so dispensed as to depress the human mind, I need not tell you; and it is a truth, which ought to be known, that the greatness of the Deity, when separated in our thoughts from his parental character, especially tends to crush human energy and hope. To a frail dependent creature, an omnipotent Creator easily becomes a terror, and his worship easily degenerates into servility, flattery, self-contempt, and selfish calculation. Religion only ennobles us, in as far as it reveals to us the tender and intimate connection of God with his creatures, and teaches us to see in the very greatness which might give alarm, the source of great and glorious communications to the human soul. You cannot, my hearers, think too highly of the majesty of God. But let not this majesty sever him from you. Remember, that his greatness is the infinity of attributes which yourselves possess. Adore his infinite wisdom; but remember, that this wisdom rejoices to diffuse itself, and let an exhilarating hope spring up, at the thought of the immeasurable intelligence which such a Father must communicate to his children. In like manner, adore his power. Let the boundless creation fill you with awe and admiration of the energy which sustains it. But remember, that God has a nobler work than the outward creation, even the spirit within yourselves; and that it is his purpose to replenish this with his own energy, and to crown it with growing power and triumphs over the material universe. Above all, adore his unutterable goodness. But remember, that this attribute is particularly proposed to you as your model; that God calls you, both by nature and revelation, to a fellowship in his philanthropy; that he has placed you in social relations, for the very end of rendering you ministers and representatives of his benevolence; that he even summons you to espouse and to advance the sublimest purpose of his goodness, the redemption of the human race, by extending the knowledge and power of Christian truth. It is through such views, that religion raises up the soul, and binds man by ennobling bonds to his Maker.

To complete my views of this topic, I beg to add an important caution. I have said, that the great work of religion is to conform ourselves to God, or to unfold the divine likeness within us. Let none infer from this language, that I place religion in unnatural effort, in straining after excitements which do not belong to the present state,

or in any thing separate from the clear and simple duties of life. I exhort you to no extravagance. I reverence human nature too much to do it violence. I see too much divinity in its ordinary operations, to urge on it a forced and vehement virtue. To grow in the likeness of God, we need not cease to be men. This likeness does not consist in extraordinary or miraculous gifts, in supernatural additions to the soul, or in any thing foreign to our original constitution, but in our essential faculties, unfolded by vigorous and conscientious exertion in the ordinary circumstances assigned by God. To resemble our Creator, we need not fly from society, and entrance ourselves in lonely contemplation and prayer. Such processes might give a feverish strength to one class of emotions, but would result in disproportion, distortion, and sickliness of mind. Our proper work is to approach God by the free and natural unfolding of our highest powers—of understanding, conscience, love, and the moral will.

Shall I be told, that, by such language, I ascribe to nature the effects which can only be wrought in the soul by the Holy Spirit? I anticipate this objection, and wish to meet it by a simple exposition of my views. I would on no account disparage the gracious aids and influences, which God imparts to the human soul. The promise of the Holy Spirit is among the most precious in the sacred volume. Worlds could not tempt me to part with the doctrine of God's intimate connection with the mind, and of his free and full communications to it. But these views are in no respect at variance with what I have taught of the method by which we are to grow in the likeness of God. Scripture and experience concur in teaching, that by the Holy Spirit, we are to understand a divine assistance adapted to our moral freedom, and accordant with the fundamental truth, that virtue is the mind's own work. By the Holy Spirit, I understand an aid, which must be gained and made effectual by our own activity; an aid, which no more interferes with our faculties, than the assistance which we receive from our fellow-beings; an aid, which silently mingles and conspires with all other helps and means of goodness; an aid, by which we unfold our natural powers in a natural order, and by which we are strengthened to understand and apply the resources derived from our munificent Creator. This aid we cannot prize too much, or pray for too earnestly. But wherein,

let me ask, does it war with the doctrine, that God is to be approached by the exercise and unfolding of our highest powers and affections, in the ordinary circumstances of human life?

I repeat it, to resemble our Maker, we need not quarrel with nature or our lot. Our present state, made up, as it is, of aids and trials, is worthy of God, and may be used throughout to assimilate us to him. For example, our domestic ties—the relations of neighbourhood and country—the daily interchanges of thoughts and feelings—the daily occasions of kindness—the daily claims of want and suffering, these, and the other circumstances of our social state, form the best sphere and school for that benevolence, which is God's brightest attribute; and we should make a sad exchange, by substituting for these natural aids, any self-invented artificial means of sanctity. Christianity, our great guide to God, never leads us away from the path of nature, and never wars with the unsophisticated dictates of conscience. We approach our Creator by every right exertion of the powers he gives us. Whenever we invigorate the understanding, by honestly and resolutely seeking truth, and by withstanding whatever might warp the judgment; whenever we invigorate the conscience, by following it in opposition to the passions; whenever we receive a blessing gratefully, bear a trial patiently, or encounter peril or scorn with moral courage; whenever we perform a disinterested deed; whenever we lift up the heart in true adoration to God; whenever we war against a habit or desire which is strengthening itself against our higher principles; whenever we think, speak, or act, with moral energy, and resolute devotion to duty,—be the occasion ever so humble, obscure, familiar, then the divinity is growing within us, and we are ascending towards our Author. True religion thus blends itself with common life. We are thus to draw nigh to God, without forsaking men. We are thus, without parting with our human nature, to clothe ourselves with the divine.

(To be Continued.)

Dialogues on Religion.—No. 2.

A. How do you do, my good friend?—I am heartily glad to see you, after so long an absence. I was begin-

ning to fear that you were unwell, or retained some coolness and shyness, after our last conversation.

T. That is not my temper. I suppose, you feel conscious that you had given some cause.

A. Why, it is so often the case now-a-days with religionists, that one may be excused for suspecting it.

T. It is natural, that we should relish the company of those who agree with us, better than of those with whom we differ. There is more cordiality and frankness, and less danger of discord, in the one case than the other.

A. That cannot be denied; but we should be on our guard, lest our aversion to converse with those of different sentiments, should grow into dislike for their persons, indifference to their welfare, and even their salvation.

T. I cannot apprehend this in myself.

A. Nor I in you: but we may both be witnesses of this process in others. Nay, I suspect, it often engenders a spirit of persecution.

T. That is an uncharitable supposition.

A. If it be true, it is not uncharitable.

T. But why do you confine this suspicion to others, and not apply the observation to yourself? This savours of bigotry.

A. I am far from confining the remark to one party: though I think, it applies to your connections rather than to mine.

T. Why so?

A. Because we do not conceive a belief in our distinguishing tenets, to be of such awful consequence, nor disbelief in them to be criminal or dangerous, provided the person be sincere. You, on the contrary, must look on unbelievers in your doctrines, as enemies to the salvation of mankind, and objects of Divine wrath. How, then, can you love those whom God hates? You remember Mr. Ivimey's words, "Shouldst thou help the ungodly, or love those that hate the Lord?"* Is it not a natural step to think, that you "do God service," by extirpating such wretches from the earth? What signifies the destruction of a few such individuals, compared with the mischief they occasion? What signifies the committing of such heretics to the flames for an hour, since they are to be burning to all eternity?

---

* Letters to the Deputies.

T. This is very shocking.

A. Is it not a natural process? I fear, that though many are incapable of such enormities, the spirit of persecution is as strong and prevalent among zealots as formerly. But you have not told me, how you spent your time since our last meeting.

T. I have been much engaged in the mornings, by calls from ministers of different denominations.

A. It is a new thing for you to have morning visitors. They came, no doubt, to congratulate you on your conversion, or confirm you in your new opinions; perhaps to give you some additional insight into the popular schemes. They are very assiduous and plausible.

T. I found most of them very pleasing and insinuating, engaging I should say, very pious and zealous. Some of them had seen a great deal of the world, and been upon missions among the heathens; and, of course, had many very extraordinary stories to tell, especially of their great success. They were all very humble men, content with miserable salaries, and living much among the poor.

A. If they be humble, I give them great praise; for they have more to gratify ambition than the Archbishop of Canterbury. To be followed by admiring multitudes —welcomed and entertained by the men, flattered and caressed by the women, is more grateful to the pride of man than extorted tithes, hereditary revenues, or arbitrary power. The missionaries, indeed, are less exposed to the delusions of vanity, and are, I think, above all praise. But I have great doubts of their success. The Trinity is an insuperable obstacle. They are under great temptations to magnify their own exploits: pious frauds have beguiled very good men; and the progress of their party at home depends greatly on the accounts that come from abroad. Some, indeed, excuse the missionaries, by supposing, that these reports receive some embellishment after their arrival. They seldom take notice of any opposition that they encounter. Dr. Marshman, for instance, deserves praise for avoiding all mention of Rammohun Roy or Mr. Adam, in his itinerant addresses! It is liberal to say nothing to their disadvantage; and prudent, not to notice his controversy with them. I suppose, each of the preachers had a separate system for your acceptance.

T. Not at all. Things are changed in that respect. They have broken down all their walls of partition. They

think nothing of Episcopacy, with its consecrations, ordinations, and liturgy, or of Presbyterianism, Congregationalism, Anabaptism, or any other isms. Your dissenting scruples, too, are all discarded. If a man be orthodox, all is well. They give him the right hand of fellowship, without asking any more questions.

A. Still, I think, these different sects must have some symbol, or, in plain English, some token, pass-word, or shibboleth.

T. Yes, if a man can pronounce Trinity, Atonement, and Original Sin, he may pass the ford.

A. Less, I believe, will do; for I observe, that the Synod of Ulster have dropped the atonement; but then they insist on justification by faith (alone, I suppose), regeneration by the Holy Spirit, and personal religion, by which, I presume, is meant experience. This is the last edition of their creed, at their meeting in June 1828; for they have had many changes of late, particularly as to subscription, verbal declaration, and examinations of schoolboys and students, on these sublime mysteries. As for the Confession of Faith, as they cannot agree among themselves, they have prudently left every Examiner to make what use of it he pleases.* They have also dispensed with predestination, election, and reprobation, In short, the Calvinists are sacrificing their peculiar notions to some Methodistical associates, who will soon leave the staunch adherents of Calvin in the lurch, and expose them to the same obloquy with the Arians, if they do not make haste to follow them, through all their extravagances.

T. They all, however, profess to maintain the fundamental principles of the Reformation, and are equally zealous in exposing the errors of Popery.

A. Ay, this is their profession; but the genuine principles of the Reformation, are, the sufficiency of Scripture, and the right of private judgment. As to the controverted points of the present day, the Reformers disputed about them among themselves, with as keen and more vulgar vituperation than our modern controversialists; and as to Popery, no doctrine occasioned greater dissension than transubstantiation in its various forms, as held by Luther, Calvin, and all but Zuinglius, who rejected it, and was therefore abused by them all. What are now called Cal-

* See Synodical Minutes, 1828, p. 32, 33.

vinistic and Reformation doctrines, are only Popish notions revived. They were borrowed from Austin, an old Popish saint, and they are still maintained in the Church of Rome by the Jansenists.

T. I know nothing of all this; nor do I trouble myself about it. I only know, that orthodox ministers are much improved in liberality, and do not seek for explanations, or stand upon stepping-stones with one another. Your long confessions are quite out of fashion, and subscription to them is exploded.

A. That is their safest plan—the only way of making common cause against Arminians and Unitarians of both descriptions, though, in the mean time, it affords a triumph to the Antrim Presbytery and the heterodox English and Irish dissenters. It must give great satisfaction to these people, to see all parties coming round to the fundamental principle of their ministers, non-subscription.

T. I think so too: but that is of little moment, compared with the spread of the Gospel. It is now disseminated, sown, and sprinkled, in the most obscure corners; and we all inquire only, where the seed is most genuine, and produces the speediest crop, whether it be at church, meeting, or mass.

A. I cannot, however, think that this wandering habit of crying, Lo, here! and Lo, there! and running after every will-with-the-wisp of a preacher, can conduce to any thing better than fomenting fanaticism.

T. Why so?

A. To constitute a respectable congregation, I conceive, there is need of a stated minister, acquainted with his flock and respected by them—possessed of some authority in families, especially with young people and children—a man of dignity and influence in society, to whom his people may look for advice and assistance, and who will superintend the religious education of the young—always at hand to comfort and pray, and perform occasional duties. A regard to the good opinion of a regular worshipping society, has great influence, too, on the characters of the individual members.

T. This did very well in its day, and still, with you, who depend on legal preaching and good works; but the regenerated Christian requires no such helps.

A. I suspect, however, that the old Orthodox ministers will be of my mind, when their people begin to stray after

itinerant preachers and Methodists, and when they find themselves supplanted by eloquent fanatical declaimers. I apprehend, that some of them find already, that a minister, who, year after year, preaches two or three times a-week to the same people, is no match for one who carries about a few popular sermons from house to house, and town to town, always adding a little seasoning, and never preaching the same discourse twice to the same hearers.

T. Well, you have been railing pretty freely against fanaticism and bigotry. Do you not think, that I might retaliate, on the score of lukewarmness and indifference?

A. It would be very unreasonable to deny you that privilege; but I shall save you the trouble, by pleading guilty. I freely confess, that rational Dissenters are chargeable with both, in a shameful degree. While the most ignorant and absurd preachers of Calvinism and Methodism are attended by crowded audiences, *their* most enlightened and eloquent ministers preach to many empty pews. This must naturally occasion relaxation on the part of the preacher; or, though his zeal may resist this chilling influence, he will find, that the same elevation of style and manner—the same animation and ardour, which are adapted to a full congregation of attentive hearers, will appear out of place, ill-timed and extravagant, to a scattered, inattentive, or indifferent company. He will find, on looking round, that many of his most affecting topics are altogether inapplicable to any one of his hearers. I confess, too, that while the Orthodox are every where erecting elegant places of worship, or rebuilding, repairing, and adorning the old, many meeting-houses of liberal Dissenters, even of the most opulent class, are in danger of falling to decay.

T. All this is so frank and fair, that it might seem ungenerous to press you any further: yet give me leave to ask you, whether this is not a proof, that Calvinistic doctrines are more startling and effective?

A. They certainly are; but it does not follow, that they are truer. It proves only, that they are better adapted to excite the multitude, who delight in being alarmed, terrified, and mystified. You cannot carry your argument further, without yielding the palm to Popery, which far outdoes you and the United Church of England and

Ireland—with all the foreign Churches combined, in numbers, devout attendance, implicit faith, and zeal for religion. This is true, not only on the Continent, where it enjoys the countenance of the ruling powers, but in Ireland, where it has laboured under every discouragement, ever since the Reformation. I think, too, you must acknowledge, that what we want in faith, we have in charity, which is the greatest of the three Christian graces, and the most efficacious to salvation; and that though we may be deficient in zeal, we excel in liberality and mutual indulgence, and are less exposed to the charge of bigotry and uncharitableness.

T. I see, there is much to be said on both sides; but as we have both something else to do, I must break off this conference for the present.—Farewell.

On Decision of Character, in the Religious Profession.

To the Editor.

Sir,

Instances are repeatedly occurring, which show that human nature is much the same in all ages. "That which hath been, is now; and that which is to be, hath already been." "How long halt ye between two opinions?" said the prophet of God, to a double-minded people; "How long halt ye between two opinions?" may now be said to many who profess the Christian name. For, how often do we hear of this person, and the other person, adopting the belief of the One God, the Father, and yet continuing, at the same time, in the profession and worship of a God the Father, a God the Son, and a God the Holy Ghost!—that is, of individuals who believe one thing, and profess and practice another thing! And strange as it may appear, "passing strange" as it is, and deeply to be lamented as it must be on sober mature reflection, these persons not unfrequently meet with applause! They are held up as examples of men of liberal, enlightened, and virtuous minds; and their good name is resounded through all the land. Yes, even *such* men are praised, and held up to public admiration—by *the advocates of truth*, held up to the admiration of *the friends of truth!* But they deserve not applause, and ought not to receive it; for

they do not act virtuously, conscientiously, nobly, in remaining in Trinitarian communion, with a faith opposed to its creed. Purity of principle, and dignity of character, would lead them to secede; and so long as they continue conformists, under such circumstances, criminality must attach to their character. For "to him that knoweth to do good, and doeth it not, to him it is sin."

I am free to confess, Mr. Editor, that I have been led to this subject, by an eulogy pronounced on the late Dr. Parr, by your excellent correspondent, G. C. S.* in common with many others in the Unitarian denomination. For it appears to be the fashion now-a-days, with many Unitarians, to laud the Doctor as a very upright and virtuous man. I have no doubt whatever, that the eulogy of G. C. S. was well meant, and that it proceeded from great candour. But I am as firmly persuaded, that it was most mistaken in its application, and is most mischievous in its tendency. For to praise, where there is an evident want of uprightness, is to weaken the moral principles in the breast, to encourage a temporising line of conduct, to foster error, and betray the interests of truth. Oh, no! praise not in such a case. For where there is a want of principle, there is a want of merit; and where merit is wanting, praise should not be proclaimed. It is not a great name, or great learning, that deserves praise, but great goodness—purity of rectitude, to God and man; without which, no attainments or qualities can impart worth to the character, and stamp it with true merit. And I beg G. C. S. and all who join with him in lauding the Doctor, to bear with me, if I say, that we want not such men as Dr. Parr,—men who make a truce with error in the haunts of corruption, and whose temporising worldly example has done more harm to the cause of truth, than the most determined opposition of its adversaries. We want such as Lindsey—of soul, noble—of virtue, great—of the love of truth, pure and unsullied—who, in obedience to the dictates of conscience, can relinquish station, popularity, interest, home, friends most dear,—

> "With the world all before them, where to choose
> Their place of rest, and Providence their guide."

Such men we want, whose example savours of heaven, and which speaks in a language that cannot be misunder-

---

* Vol. III. p. 108.

stood, and that cannot be resisted; and which will continue thus to speak, when their ashes shall have long been mingled with their kindred dust. Oh! be their memories blessed—their praise resounded from age to age, till time shall be no more. And having "turned many unto righteousness, may they shine as stars in the firmament, for ever and ever."

I have felt it to be my duty, thus plainly to state my motive for writing, and also to enter my protest against all such praise as that in which G. C. S. has indulged, in the communication to which I have before alluded. In doing so, it has been far from my intention to offend him; and I trust, he possesses too great nobleness of mind, to be offended with any one, for exercising that freedom in the expression of opinion, which he himself holds most dear, and claims as an inalienable right. But I beg leave to state, likewise, that the communication of G. C. S. is not my *only* reason for writing. He is only one among many, in the Unitarian denomination, who delight in the Doctor's praise. We hear it often; we have long heard it; the lisping babe may hear it, and when the lisping babe may become a man, he may think it right, and meritorious, and noble, to do as Dr. Parr did, and, with the belief of only One God the Father, profess and worship a Trinity.

At the commencement of inquiry, and for some time afterwards, a man may hesitate between opposing systems; but he cannot go on hesitating, if he be truly sincere—that is, if he be truly conscientious, he cannot live in the occasional profession of doctrines, which are at variance with each other; he cannot, at the same time, profess Unitarianism and Trinitarianism; he cannot, at the same time, say, by his words, that this doctrine is right, and say, by his conduct, that the opposite doctrine is right. A regard to sincerity and conscious rectitude, would prompt him to decide, as soon as possible, between their different claims. And when he has decided, he will not falsify, by his profession, his inward conviction; he will not believe one thing, and profess another. On the contrary, he will obey the dictates of conscience, with the utmost singleness of heart. In short, a truly conscientious character, is a decisive character. His inward conviction, and his outward conduct, are consistent with each other. What he believes, he practises; and practice follows belief, without any hesitation, parleying, or tamper-

ing with sincerity. He no more doubts his obligations to obey the dictates of conscience, than he does to obey the authority and commands of God. In short, he esteems conscience to be God's vicegerent within him; and he regards its suggestions as sacred and imperative, as though God himself spoke to him with an audible voice.

Without decision of character, therefore, there can be no purity of conscience; and without purity of conscience, it were vain to expect the favour and approbation of God: that God, who "looketh for truth in the inward parts," and who "taketh pleasure in uprightness."

And such is the plain declaration of the Scriptures. For we are not only exhorted, to "judge for ourselves what is right," to "be fully persuaded in our own minds," to "prove all things," and "hold fast that which is good," but we are told, that it is vain for a "double-minded man to think that he shall receive any thing of the Lord;" that "whatsoever is not of faith," or principle, "is sin;" and that "he who knew his master's will, and did it not, shall be beaten with many stripes."

Religious decision, therefore, being the same as religious sincerity, is essentially necessary to divine acceptance; the first ingredient in the religious profession; and without which, that profession is a mockery to God, and vain to man.

If we view religious decision in its influence and effects, we shall find, that it is not less strongly recommended to our consideration, or enforced upon our obedience.

It is our duty, as involving in it purity of principle, and rectitude of conduct. And it is our interest, as leading to individual and general good. It arrives at the wished-for object, at the soonest possible period. It does not halt in its way—it does not loiter in its course, but proceeds straight forward in the path of duty, with an undeviating accelerated step; and speedily does it emancipate the soul from doubt, perplexity, difficulty, prejudice, and all the slavish customs of a vain and trifling world. Fear does it throw from it, as the summer's insects are brushed away with the waving of the hand. It is the true exemplification of the words of the Apostle, "God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power, and of love, and of a sound mind." Energy inspires its spirit, prompts its actions, and crowns its efforts with success. It gives peace and satisfaction, joy and delight, to the mind, as it gives as-

surance and confidence, and presents to reflection, worthy and noble deeds, such as the mind can dwell upon with pleasure, and God behold with complacency and love. It improves the soul in all virtue and piety, as it admits it freely and at once into the true spirit of Christianity; and as it removes all obstacles to the soul's progress, it carries it forward continually to new attainments, and ultimately to perfection. All this it is to individuals; and what it is to individuals, it is to the world at large. It is, therefore, the most favourable to the progress of truth—of virtue and piety, in the minds of individuals—and in the minds of men, collectively, as forming one social community on the face of the earth. It admits all, thus promptly and freely into the light of truth, the purity of virtue, the fervency of piety; and all does it thus carry forward to perfection, as on angels' wings.

And what an example does it present to the world!—an example of all that is holy in purpose, pure in principle, prompt in obedience, cheerful in duty, noble in action, and dignified in soul!—an example which all, who are in anywise impressible by goodness, must venerate, admire, and love!—an example which strikes the mind with an irresistible force, and which operates upon it as if by inspiration. "As if by inspiration," did I say? What is it else? What is it, but the *spirit* of that religion, which *is* spirit?—that religion which flows from the One Great Spirit, in an ineffable stream of goodness and love? Oh, yes! it is not material—it *is* spirit, *divine* spirit, emanating from God.

May it be diffused widely and more widely among the disciples of his Son—among all his children upon earth; until all shall be changed into the same image, from glory to glory; and truth, virtue, and happiness, shall universally prevail.—Amen. K.

Notes on Passages of Scripture.

"That book from which Christian theology is derived, is a fountain, at which every man must draw, in preference even to the clearest of the streams which flow from it."—*Bishop Marsh.*

Prov. xiv. 32, "The wicked is driven away in his wickedness: but the righteous hath hope in his death."

I doubt whether this verse is justly translated and understood; the contrast described not being exactly what our English Bible presents. A more eligible rendering has been proposed:

"In [or, "by means of] his wickedness, the wicked man is agitated. But the righteous man hath confidence *even* in death."

Accordingly, Mr. Lowth's paraphrase of the words, is, "When a wicked man falls into calamity, his heart fails him, and he is driven away from all his confidences, like the chaff before the wind, by the conscience of his own wickedness: but a righteous man is not dismayed in the greatest dangers, but remains steady and confident, even in death itself."*

Jer. x. 11, "Thus shall ye say unto them, The gods that have not made the heavens and the earth, even they shall perish from under these heavens."

This passage is written in the Chaldee tongue; and the words have been supposed to contain a proclamation, which Jehovah enjoins the Jews, when they should be captives in Babylon, to utter against the Heathen idols, in the language of the conquerors.†

One manuscript omits the verse, which Blayney,‡ with good reason, suspects to have been interpolated.

It is remarkable enough, that S. Castalio, in his Latin translation of the Bible, has rendered these clauses into the Italian language:

"Cosi gli direte, Gli iddii i quali non hanno fatto il cielo e la terra, saranno tolti de la terra, e di sotto cielo."

I am not acquainted with any other version of the Scriptures, in which the same peculiarity appears. Some persons may be of opinion, that, on this principle, and for the sake of consistency, Castalio should have employed Italian in translating not a few chapters of Ezra and of Daniel.§

---

* With this translation agree Luther's, and, substantially, Diodati's and Dathe's, as well as Houbigant's. The version by the last of these authors, is, "Animo concidet in sua calamitate vir impius; vir justus ipsa in morte confidens erit." In opposition, I confess, to the majority of translators, and therefore, with particular deference, I have selected the term "wickedness," as the more eligible.

† Joseph Mede's Works, p. 187, (4th ed.)

‡ Translation and Not. in loc. See also Baver, in loc. The annotation of Le Clerc, is learned and ingenious: but he looks upon the words as having been written by Jeremiah.

§ Masclef's Gram. &c. Vol. ii. p. 90, &c. (2d ed.)

Luke vii. 8, "I also am a man set under authority" [υπο εξουσιαν τασσομενος].

The sentiment and the practice are illustrated, and so, in some degree, is the phraseology, by a passage in Josephus:* αυτος ωσπερ υμεις επιτασσομαι. It is the address of Petronius, President of Syria, to the Jews, on their remonstrating with him against the erection of the image of the emperor Caligula in their temple.

Luke vii. 19, "Art thou he that should come?" &c.

In one of Dr. Henry Owen's posthumous sermons, I met with an ingenious attempt at explaining this part of the Gospel History. He supposes that the Baptist might be in doubt, whether the spirit *remained* on Jesus. John i. 33. But the objection to such an hypothesis is, that John can scarcely be conceived to have been ignorant of our Lord's miraculous works: for, in the verse preceding this inquiry, (Luke vii. 18,) we read, "And the disciples of John showed him of all these things."

John vi. 69, "We believe and are sure, that thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God."†

According to the best authorities, "that thou art the Holy One of God." The meaning of this phrase, *the holy one*, appears from a parallel text, Rev. iii. 7, "these things saith he that is holy;" on which Eichhorn‡ thus comments, "ο αγιος est legatus divinus, John vi. 69, (in varia lectione, Acts iv. 27,) unde αγιαζειν divinum aliquem legatum declarare, John x. 36, Heb. i. 7, coll. John xvii. 17–19.)"

John vi. 70, 71, "Jesus answered them, Have not I chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil,‖ [a false accuser, or calumniator]? He spake of Judas Iscariot, the son of Simon: for he it was that should betray him, being one of the twelve."

Locke, in his Reasonableness of Christianity,§ gives what I think a correct, as it assuredly is a most ingenious statement of the connection of these verses with the preceding: "Peter having said, We believe, and are sure, that thou art the Messiah, the Son of the living God, Jesus answered them, Have not I chosen you twelve, and one of you is διαβολος? This is a reply seeming, at first sight, nothing to the purpose, when yet it is sure all our

---

* Bell. Jud. L. ii. C. x. § 4. † Griesbach, N. T. in loc. ‡ Comment. in Apoc. vol. i. p. 131, 132. ‖ According to Principal Campbell, in loc. "a spy." § Pages 78, 79. [1810. Lond. 12mo.]

Saviour's discourses were wise and pertinent. It seems therefore to me to carry this sense, to be understood afterwards by the eleven (as that of destroying the temple and raising it again in three days was), when they should reflect on it after his being betrayed by Judas,—You have confessed and believed the truth concerning me: I am the Messiah your king. But do not wonder at it that I have never openly declared it to you; for amongst you twelve, whom I have chosen to be with me, there is one who is an informer, or false accuser (for so the Greek word signifies, and may possibly here be so translated, rather than *devil*), who, if I had owned myself in plain words to have been the Messiah, *the king of Israel*, would have betrayed me, and informed against me."

It may be added, that all Mr. Locke's remarks on John vi.* are highly valuable, and furnish a key to the meaning of the contents of the chapter.

Acts xvii. 19, "they brought him to Areopagus," &c. Newcome more properly translates it, "*the court of* Areopagus." See, among numerous authorities, Æschylus, Eumenid. ll. 680, &c.

———αδεκασδον τουτο βουλευτηριον
Παγον δ' Αρειον τονδε.

Rom. i. 4, "declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead."

Clearness and precision of statement, are of special importance in theology. For example, we should carefully discriminate, like the Apostle, in this verse, between the *office* and the *nature* of Jesus Christ. Newcome has not been quite mindful of the distinction.† N.

Reflections on the Principles & Evidences of Christianity.

LETTER V.

On the Manifestations of Jesus to his Female Disciples.

It has appeared from the original testimony of the guards at the sepulchre of Jesus, that he was removed from it, or withdrawn from observation, while a celestial messenger

* Reasonableness of Christianity, p. 76, 77. † Observ. &c. on our Lord's conduct, &c. p. 482.

remained by it. We are informed, Mark xvi. 9, that "he appeared first to Mary Magdalene;" and John commences this part of his narrative, with an account of her coming to the sepulchre, "early when it was yet dark," chap. xx. 1. &c. All that she observed in the first instance, was, that "the stone was taken away, and that the body of Jesus was not visibly there." Her inference was, that "they," meaning, probably, his enemies, "had taken away the Lord, and she knew not where they had laid him." Her report bringing Peter and John to the sepulchre, they appear to have been divided between "wonder" and "belief," on observing, in addition to the above circumcumstances, the orderly arrangement of the grave-clothes. But while *they* ruminated on the cause of these extraordinary and unexpected occurrences, *Mary's* mind was evidently intent on nothing, but the discovery of the dead body; her grief at being thus deprived of the opportunity of paying her last honours to it, sufficiently showing that not a ray of hope, respecting his revival, had reached her: absorbed in this pursuit, she is no otherwise affected by the singular and glorious sight of two heavenly visitants sitting *within* the sepulchre, than to acquaint them with the removal of the body, and to turn away in quest of it. Even the living person of Jesus, which is now presented to her view, is mistaken for a stranger, and she eagerly inquires of him for the only object which engrossed her faculties, and in a great measure withheld her senses from the far more interesting objects, which solicited her attention. These, therefore, could not be the creations of an imagination which was so intent on one of an opposite description, that, inconceivably wonderful and gratifying as they were in their own nature, they could not divert it from that on which it was fixed. Her name, uttered by Jesus in his usual accent of kindness, dispels her reverie; and, as if forgetting all the intermediate ideas, she addresses, and is about to offer him her accustomed marks of veneration. Here is no alarm—no suspicion that she is conversing with the spirit of the dead; which is the more remarkable, as she had, the moment preceding, the fullest persuasion that he was in the state of death, and had plainly not the most remote idea of his revival. Grief at the loss of the inanimate Jesus, and joy at the cognizance of his living person, had, in succession, so entirely occupied the whole mental power, as to

leave no room for any other idea or sentiment. The angels must have been previously invisible, or they would have attracted the notice of the Apostles, who had so minutely examined the contents of the sepulchre; or of Mary, whose attention was so constantly directed towards it: and as Jesus had not before been seen since the arrival of the angel, it is highly probable, that, from the same invisible state, he now assumed the ordinary appearance of humanity. He accordingly intimates to Mary, in the softest language, his celestial separation from her and his disciples in general. "Touch me not; for I am not yet ascended to my Father; but go to my brethren, and say, I ascend unto my Father and your Father, and to my God and your God." These words were calculated to moderate the tumultuous emotions both of grief and joy with which her breast had been agitated in such quick succession; to lead her views to the objects of his mission and predictions, and to chasten her worldly attachments, with the hope, through the medium of his person, of future social felicity, in a nearer approach to the universal God and Father. Whether he was then tangible, cannot be determined; he certainly conveys an intimation that he should not retain a gross tangible body, but that it was about to undergo a celestial change, in which it would be removed from all our senses. Such an intimation as this, was equally remote from the apprehensions of his female disciple, with all the preceding miraculous facts which were presented to her. Thus, Jesus and his angelic attendance, after frustrating the arms and vigilance of Roman soldiers, by an opposite course of procedure, introduce themselves to the feeble and solitary friend of Jesus, and reveal, in a manner as unexpected and contrary to the previous anticipations of her mind, the glorious fact of his resurrection and transition to immortal blessedness.

The words, "*I have not yet ascended to my Father*," have been understood, by modern commentators, to mean, "*I shall not yet ascend*," &c. This appears to be a forced sense, which by no means agrees with the next clause;—*but go to my brethren and say to them, I ascend unto my Father and your Father; and to my God and your God.*" The whole is adapted to convey the idea that he was about, or almost in the very act of ascending, instead of that a considerable time would elapse

prior to its occurrence. Whitby says, "that he had been inclined to think, that Jesus was immediately to ascend into the heavenly sanctuary: for why else doth he say, *Hold, or detain me not, for I have not yet ascended?* Why doth he add these words, *go, tell my disciples I ascend?*" and adds, that he had abandoned this opinion, from finding no such immediate ascent spoken of by any of the Evangelists, &c. But if, as we have seen, Jesus on his resurrection, passed immediately into an invisible, and in all probability, a celestial state, and from this time forward, only occasionally assumed the form or substance of ordinary humanity, for the purpose of making himself known to suitable witnesses,—the language appears appropriate. "Previous to my crucifixion, I had predicted to my disciples, my speedy removal from them, and that it was expedient for them that I should go away, both that I might 'send the Holy Spirit to them; and prepare for them a place in my Father's house,' all which is now about to be realized; and though you now see me in the ordinary form of mortals, I am, in fact, nearly withdrawn wholly from that state, and prepared for my ascent to heaven. Deliver, however, this affectionate message to my disciples;—Tell them, that I regard them as my brethren in the blessings of my gospel: I, indeed, have gone before them as I predicted, but we have one common God and Father, who will in his own time, in like manner, as you now see about to be accomplished in myself, make them partakers of celestial happiness."

It may, I conceive, be justly asserted, that this address could only have proceeded from the lips of Jesus; the very notion of the translation of a grossly corporeal to a refined and spiritual body, as is plainly implied in an ascension to heaven, was opposed and offensive to the received ideas of the world in general, and particularly abhorrent to the expectations of the Jews, as applied to their Messiah, who wanted not an invisible being, an inhabitant of heaven, but a warlike commander, who should emancipate them from the Roman yoke, and lead them on through a series of bloody conquests to universal empire. When Jesus was ordinarily conversant with his disciples, he commonly spake of God as *his Father*, and acquiesced in being regarded as their "*Lord and Master.*" But in this, his risen and glorified estate, being about to elevate their views, and refine their affections, so as to render

them more congenial with his own, he acknowledges them for his brethren—children of the same heavenly Father! From whose lips but those of the risen Jesus, could such amiable condescension, such heightened humility, with the elevation of his circumstances, have proceeded? No language of imposition would have represented the Messiah, thus elevated above the power of death, as addressing in these terms, the poor, unlettered Galileans, whose courage in his defence had abandoned them in the hour of trial, and left him exposed to the unrelenting cruelty of his enemies. But, while it was not calculated to create in them any expectations of his meeting them any where on earth, it must tend to allay all their fears of his displeasure, and, consequently, to prepare them for any future meetings with him, without trepidation, and with lively interest.

We learn from the Evangelists, (Mark xvi. 1, &c. and Luke xxiii. 55, 56, and xxiv, &c.) that a company of the female disciples of Jesus, had agreed to go to the sepulchre early on the first day of the week, for the purpose of bestowing their last sad tribute of respect to him, by anointing the dead body. Among these was Mary Magdalene, who, however had, from the account we have noticed, gone before the rest of the company, "while it was yet dark," they not reaching the place till "the rising of the sun." *They* also observed that the stone was rolled from the sepulchre; and on entering it, saw an angel in the form of "a young man, sitting on the right side, clothed in a long white garment." (Mark xvi. 5.) His appearance was such as to cause them some alarm; but he calms their fears; prevents their inquiries, by informing them that Jesus was risen, agreeably to his prediction, and that he was gone before the disciples into Galilee, as he had also foretold; with which intelligence they were despatched to the Apostles and their companions. Luke relates, that "two men in shining garments" were seen on this occasion, from which it appears that both the extraordinary persons who had been seen by Mary, were presented to some of the company, from whom the narrative of this Evangelist was derived. The occasional invisibility of one, or both the angels, as of Jesus, and their unexpected manifestations, are illustrative of the general principle of those transitions through which he passed, and with their constant attendance upon

him, and intimate knowledge of his proceedings, evince that he was now become a companion of this celestial order of beings. It is evident, that, as these female disciples went to the sepulchre, for the sole purpose of anointing the corpse of Jesus, they could not have entertained the least conception of the various extraordinary and supernatural particulars which were presented to their observation, and made known to them. They had been at considerable pains and expense in preparing "spices and ointments" for their funeral purpose; whereas very different ideas and arrangements must have occupied their minds, had they at all understood his prediction, that, on the third day, he would rise again; or in any degree anticipated the glorious objects and most cheering intelligence which was now brought home to their senses and conviction. Here, then, is a third instance of the power of supernatural facts, in effecting an entire revolution on minds wholly occupied with prepossessions of an opposite description.

Intent as they now were on the delivery of the message they had just received, that Jesus was about to meet his disciples in Galilee, they are most unexpectedly accosted by him on their way from the sepulchre;—but, perfectly recognizing his person, they "hold him by the feet," and pay him reverence. There is a remarkable difference between both his circumstance, and the message of which they now received a confirmation from his own lips, and those related by Mary; she being restrained from a similar act, and led to look forward only to his approaching ascension. These apparent discrepances sufficiently show that there could be no concerted scheme between these women for the accomplishment of any private designs of their own. They receive their solution only from the reality of the facts, that Jesus being raised to a superior state, and about to withdraw from all immediate intercourse with mortals, first apprizes his disciples of these events, and then acquaints them, that he will, nevertheless, not wholly disappear from them till he has accomplished his promise of meeting them in his native country.

HOMO.

To the Editor of the Pioneer.

SIR,

THE following is a copy of a letter, lately sent by me to the Burgher Minister of this town, stating facts and remarks respecting his conduct to me. Your giving it a place in an early number of your valuable publication, with such animadversions as you may deem proper, will be the means of exposing, and perhaps checking, that priestly tyranny which is too often exercised over the timid and submissive hearer. Although I keenly felt the insult, yet I have reason to bless God that it was a means, among others, of turning my attention to that "purer light," where I can see "light more clearly," and of adopting those rational and consistent sentiments, which have supported me under many, and deep afflictions,

I am, SIR, yours respectfully,

ANDREW PROCTOR.

To the Rev. David Inglis.

REV. SIR, *PORT-GLASGOW, Sept.* 9, 1828.

IT is some time since I intended writing you, respecting the manner in which you acted towards me, while a member of your congregation. It is not a pleasant task for a person who ought to have been instructed by you, to be under the necessity of directing your attention to what really constitutes Christian conduct; but, disagreeable as it may be to my own feelings, I cannot allow such a malignant action to pass, without raising my voice against it. This I should have considered my duty, had it been performed towards another, and I must feel so much the more keenly, when I myself was the object upon whom you manifested the malignant spirit, which it is my object to condemn.

You are well aware, that I was a member of your congregation for about twenty-two years, during which time I was never refused church privileges. To my character, I may say, no objection had ever been made, and I am persuaded, that, in the town, you will find many who will freely attest that this is no vain boast. From what cause, then, you was led to act towards me as you have done, I am quite at a loss to discover.

Without any ceremony whatever, without ever informing me of your intention, and without the least suspicion, on my part, that such a course was to be pursued, you were pleased to erase my name from the communion roll. Now, even supposing that I had acted improperly, suppose that I had violated some of the Christian laws, what would have been your duty? If you are at all acquainted with the spirit, or the principles of the New Testament, you must be aware, that a brother is not to be rejected, until you have used every means to bring him to the knowledge and the practice of the truth. What makes your conduct to me the more glaring, is, that you acted upon quite a different principle with one of your late members, who was well known to be of the Unitarian persuasion; you called frequently upon him; you also brought him before your Session, and you endeavoured to reason with him, in the best manner you could, in order to reclaim him from, what you considered, his heretical opinions. So far you acted right. But perhaps you had other motives, than the spirit of the Gospel, to lead you to pursue such a course with him. And the probability is, that had he been placed in equal circumstances with myself, you would have left him to wander on, in what you deem the dangerous road, and would have contented yourself with an act of excommunication! Perhaps you will plead, as your excuse, that I was irregular in my attendance on your ministry, for some time previous to your erasing my name from the list of communicants; still, it was your duty to call on me, and ascertain the cause of my absence. Had you done so, then I should have considered you a man interested in the welfare of your fellow-creatures. But, when I perceive that you are deeply interested in securing the countenance and support of the wealthy, and that you can overlook the poor man, and eject him from your society, without any uneasiness, I cannot help concluding, that you have more of the spirit of the world than the spirit of Christ. I assure you, that my absenting myself from your meeting-house, arose from no disrespect to the ordinances of public worship, but because I could feel no pleasure or profit in listening to discourses that appeared to me composed of a series of contradictions. I now leave you to reflect upon your conduct. Compare it with the character of that Master whom you profess to serve; and if

your own conscience acquit you, I shall not condemn you. I am still, I trust, deeply influenced with the spirit of the Gospel. I am anxious to worship as Jesus Christ taught his disciples; and from the judgment of erring man, I can appeal to that of my Heavenly Father. The doctrines which you teach, and the principles on which you seem to act, appear to me, to have no connection with the religion of Jesus. If this letter should awaken you to a sense of your duty, I shall be very happy to have a visit from you; or, if you should please to reply in writing to what I have said, I have no objections to state and defend the sentiments which I now entertain, respecting the Gospel of the ever-blessed God.

I remain, Rev. Sir,

Andrew Proctor.

P. S.—If the same indifference is shown to this letter that was displayed respecting my spiritual concerns, in the course of two weeks I shall take such measures as will exhibit, in a pre-eminently conspicuous manner, the pious care that a Burgher Minister has for the less wealthy of his flock. A. P.

Every one who reads this case, must acknowledge, we think, the improper and unchristian conduct of the clergyman towards his hearer. No notice, whatever, has been taken of the complaining letter. Had Mr. Proctor entertained opinions on the *mercy* of the God of Love, diametrically opposed to the statements of Confessions and Covenants, this heresy would have been overlooked, even by Mr. Inglis and his Elders, had he kept his sentiments within his own breast. But, to be supposed capable of believing that God is *One*, as well as *Good*, this was an unpardonable sin; and the pure flock could only be preserved from this double contamination, by cutting off the suspected misbeliever. Surely, however, it would but have been kind, to say nothing of just, had the pastor visited his old and heretofore regular attendant, previously to depriving him of his church privileges. Could any charge of immorality have been produced against him, doubtless, it would long ere this have been forthcoming. Nothing of the kind is even insinuated. The individual appears to have been debarred from celebrating the memorial of the love of the Saviour, not because he had avowed Unitarianism, (for, then, in our judgment,

he would have had no ground of complaint, and, indeed, we should, in such a case, have been the first to reprobate him for his want of moral honesty, in sitting beside a Trinitarian altar,) but, simply, because he was inquiring, and preferred reading his Bible to find the truth, instead of implicitly receiving as gospel, the dictates of fallible mortals. We do think, therefore, that there has been in Mr. Proctor's case, a violation of justice, a setting at nought of the principles of Christian charity. It affords another lesson, of the tyrannical tendency of creed religion; it is an additional proof, that when any thing is substituted in place of the Scriptures, intolerance and bigotry will bear sway. Mr. Proctor has been treated even worse than a condemned criminal. Had one of the Rev. David Inglis' flock been sentenced by the Justiciary of his country, can there be a doubt, that the Pastor would have visited him to his last hour, worked upon the unfortunate's mind by terror, forced upon him miscalled repentance; assured him, if faith in the all-atoning merits had been his *profession*, of pardon and acceptance; and sent, in the eyes of the multitude, the criminal from the gallows to glory? Yet, for a man who had attended the same place of worship twenty-two years, against whose moral conduct, humble though his station, no charge could be made; on mere suspicion that he had departed from the faith of his forefathers, and would be proved to be too honest, to believe one thing and profess another, this Minister of the Gospel, strikes out the man's name from the communion roll, exposing him still more to the fearful and damning dangers of heresy; and when remonstrated with, by the presumed victim of his fanaticism, gives no sign either of justice or benevolence! But the wrath of man, even in this instance, is made the instrument of Jehovah's praise. Out of this evil, good has arisen, and the persecuted individual, led in mercy to the light of scriptural knowledge, and the open profession of despised and unpopular truth. May he, indeed, find peace to his soul, in the reception and practice of pure and undefiled religion; and may this example of religious integrity, stimulate others to be like minded, and induce those who deem themselves the possessors of pure and benevolent and ennobling principles of Christianity, to put forth their most strenuous efforts in the diffusion of knowledge, and the dissemination and upholding of the worship of the Father in spirit and in truth.—*Edit.*

Sonnet.

'Tis eve, and twilight over land and sea,
Outstretches rapidly her mantle gray;
Peaceful serenity now holds her sway
Over the world. Oh! how beauteously
Does wearied Nature sink into her rest!
What are my thoughts at this so sacred hour?
Does fancy hold me in her magic power?
Oh! there arise within my gladden'd breast,
Feelings of deepest awe, and sacred love
Of Him, the Lord of tempest and of calm,
Who stills the north wind—bids the zephyr's balm
Float o'er the world. O Thou who dwell'st above,
Without thy mercy all would be distress,
And human life a cold, bleak wildnerness!

Feb. 1829. T. M.

THE CHRISTIAN PIONEER.

Glasgow, *February* 28, 1829.

We have read, with feelings of sorrow and compassion, the accounts of what are called "Revivals," which, during the last few months, have disgraced certain portions of Wales. Our sorrow has been called forth, that such outrages on the Christian religion should still be exhibited. Our compassion has been excited, that any beings gifted with reason, and blessed with Revelation, should thus unman their natures, and, regardless of the privileges which they possess, should debase themselves by fanaticism so truly appalling. We regard such scenes as a powerful call on every one who would support the dignity of human nature, and promote the happiness of his fellow-creatures, and disseminate the pure knowledge of God our Father, to exert all his powers to uproot opinions which lead to such excesses. The man who does not feel himself "zealously affected" in such a cause, or who can sit by idle and indifferent, whilst his fellow men are thus demoralizing themselves, must be deaf to the pleadings of humanity, and insensible to the claims of Christianity; nor would he "cry aloud and spare not" religious error, and point the way to truth and righteousness, though

one should rise from the dead. An eye-witness thus describes the circumstances which occurred at Neath, in Glamorganshire:—

"On Christmas-day, a considerable body of both sexes entered the town, singing vociferously as they marched along, hand in hand, and using divers rather portentous gesticulations in their progress. On inquiry, I was told that this party consisted of '*Revivalists*' from Lansamlet, and they were come to assist at the opening of a newly-erected chapel, belonging to the Welsh Calvinistic Methodists. I visited this chapel both before and after morning service at church: the first time, I heard some startling bursts of exclamation from the congregation, under a sermon which was delivering with great energy; but on my return, the place was become a perfect Babel, and I retreated in haste from the confusion. It was in the evening, however, that I witnessed the greatest excesses, and indulged myself, with painful curiosity, in a minute and protracted observation. When I arrived, the regular service was over, and the preachers had withdrawn, leaving their flock in a condition certainly very unlike meek and docile sheep who had been feeding in the green pastures of sound doctrine;—a herd of cattle, stung by hornets, and flinging and bellowing in their agony, was the only *pastoral* similitude I could think of. I found myself in the midst of an uproar, which filled me with amazement and pain of mind. Clusters of men and women, boys and girls, were leaping about the chapel, shouting, screaming, and singing; throwing their arms aloft like maniacs, and frequently embracing each other. I observed several elderly men busied in walking about amongst these poor over-excited creatures, in a sort of minuet step, chanting to them portions of hymns, in a peculiar kind of recitative, which seemed to aid in keeping alive this unnatural fervour: others, particularly the females in the galleries, cheered them on with clapping of hands, waving of shawls, hats, and handkerchiefs; some in the front seats leaned forward and slapped their hands on the pannels, and all raised loud cries, which may, not without reason, be called *yells*. By degrees, the most obstreperous jumpers concentrated themselves in the middle of the chapel, which was illuminated by a large circle of lights suspended from the ceiling; this was soon set twirling round like a whirligig, by their extravagant flourishes, till I thought the candles in peril of extinction. At this moment, indeed, there was an irresistible touch of the ludicrous in the scene—it seemed as though the vertigo in the people's brains had communicated itself to the very candles; and there was such a whimsical unison in their aerial dance, with the wild movements on the floor and benches below, that I could not severely blame those among the numerous spectators who showed signs of merriment: but my own comic emotions speedily subsided into an inexpressible melancholy, which had previously taken full possession of me. Crowds of visitors continued coming in and going out, as long as this pitiable exhibition lasted, and it did not close till about midnight; when some of the infatuated poor souls were

so exhausted, that they required to be led or carried out of the place, which they had been really converting into the lively semblance of a *heathen temple*, under a mistaken notion of praising the true and living God, who, we are assured by the great Apostle of the Gentiles, "is not the author of CONFUSION, but of PEACE, *as in all the churches of the saints.*"

We have much pleasure in directing the attention of our readers to the proceedings of a meeting of the Catholics of the County of Antrim, Ireland, held in Belfast, on the 27th January. The chapel was completely filled, and we rejoice to say, that many individuals, both of the Presbyterian and Episcopal persuasion, were also present. The whole of the addresses were characterised by an ardent spirit of enlightened freedom and Christian benevolence. The Catholic Bishop of Down and Connor, the Right Rev. Dr. Crolly, was the Chairman. We gladly make an extract or two from his introductory speech.

"Our allegiance," said the Bishop, "is unimpeached; our faithful attachment to the throne and the constitution, cannot be disputed; our services to the country, are established by incontrovertible facts. In return for these, we ask for no remuneration, but a fair and equitable enjoyment of our civil rights, together with our fellow subjects of every denomination. What unprejudiced mind can see any difficulties in a case such as ours? There is not a court of equity on earth, where our question would not be disposed of in five minutes. The Premier pretends that we should render our cause an important service, by burying it for some time in oblivion. This proposal appears to us incompatible with honour, with reason, and with justice. Our detestation of oppression, and our love of freedom, are blended with our nature, and rooted in our very soul. Those feelings are sanctioned by the dictates of our conscience, and congenial with our purest affections. Why, then, bury them in oblivion? No; we will persevere till we have obtained the full recognition of our just, our inalienable rights. We may be told, that the Premier's proposal is founded in friendship; that he only requires time to correspond with the Pope, for the purpose of obtaining a concordatum. Such an application to the Court of Rome, I hold to be most impolitic and unconstitutional. The Pope is not our Sovereign, nor is he even our fellow subject. He is neither the head nor a member of our political society. What right, then, has he to be consulted on a subject connected with our civil rights, or to interfere with our temporal concerns? Our business is with the King and the Legislature, as British subjects. From them we claim our Civil and Religious Liberties, and we will not suffer any power, either foreign or domestic, to deprive us of our rights."

The Rev. Henry Montgomery did not enter the chapel till some time after the proceedings had commenced, when he was received with loud and enthusiastic cheers. Mention was, by several speakers, made of his exertions in behalf of the rights of conscience, and especially of his addresses in Manchester and London; and, when towards the close of the meeting, Mr. Montgomery advanced to the altar, he was received with the most enthusiastic cheers, the immense multitude rising with one simultaneous impulse.

Mr Montgomery said, "he regretted that he was unable to address the meeting as he would wish. He was labouring under a severe indisposition from cold, and the manner in which he had been received by his Catholic countrymen, completely overpowered his feelings. The latter circumstance, however, only confirmed him in an opinion of which he had long been convinced. When even the expression of common sympathy produces such a demonstration of grateful and kindly feeling, it surely ought to be a lesson to our Legislators, and prove to them what they might expect from the Irish people, if they treated them as justice and sound policy would direct. He felt that his present situation was a strange one. A Presbyterian Minister standing on a Catholic altar, beside a Catholic Prelate, with whom he lived on the most friendly terms, and addressing his Roman Catholic countrymen on the subject of their grievances, was unfortunately at the present period, no ordinary occurrence. How is it, said he, that I, who differ so widely from you in my religious sentiments, should be received by you with such testimonies of cordiality and affection, while those who agree most with you in theological opinions, are the bitterest enemies of your rights? Is it because the old saying holds good in this, as in other cases, that in family feuds, the nearer the relationship, the more bitter is the enmity; or does it arise from the intermingling a portion of that charity which Christianity inculcates, and which is calculated to diffuse principles of peace, and harmony, and brotherhood, among all sects and denominations? I had intended elsewhere to express my opinion on the question of your claims; but from the manner in which I have been alluded to by the gentleman who moved the last resolution; and from the kind and flattering manner in which every allusion to me has been received, I feel that I should be guilty of a dereliction of duty, did I not come forward to express my gratitude by again putting on record my attachment to those glorious principles of Civil and Religious Liberty, for the support of which you have this day assembled."

"I do hold that the spread of liberal sentiments, combined with your own strenuous and constitutional exertions, will carry your question forward in a manner that your own isolated exertions could not effect; and that Irish energy on the one hand, and British firmness on the other, will show to the governors of the

country, the necessity of wiping away every remnant of penal enactments against religious opinions. It is matter of deep regret to me, that among Presbyterians, there should exist any hostility to the rights and privileges of their fellow subjects; but the Presbyterians who oppose your claims, either do not, or will not understand the fundamental principles of their own church—a church based on the foundation of Civil and Religious Liberty. I am sorry to find that in Scotland, some Presbyteries have come forward to petition against your rights; but in what manner have they put on record this declaration of their principles? Have they protested, as they have heretofore done, both against Popery and Prelacy? No; they have become sycophants of the Church of England, and they have their reward in seeing Prelacy making rapid inroads upon their own congregations, and the Chapels of the Church of England continually increasing in number, in a country where Presbyterianism is the religion established by law."

"I have seen it stated, in a late number of *Blackwood's Magazine*, as one remedy for all the evils of Ireland—to build new churches. If churches really be wanted, the proposal is an excellent one, though I doubt much if it would produce all those mighty effects which the sagacious propounder anticipates. I should wish that you, and my brethren of the Established Church were of the same religious sentiments as myself; but I would not, had I the power, compel you, contrary to your inclinations, to worship God as I do. You would not then be rendering him the service of the heart. You would not even be worshipping God; you would be worshipping me, whom you feared. If churches then be wanted, let them be built. Let the Roman Catholics be taxed for their erection, if they be necessary; but if there be no congregations to fill them, I imagine the Irish Catholics will think they have already enough to bear upon that score, without adding to their burthens. But this plan is to be followed up by another, which far exceeds it in originality. Colonies of Protestants are to be settled in all the Catholic parts of Ireland, so as to make the Protestant population equal to the Catholic. Now, supposing that a sufficient number of Protestants from Ulster could be procured, it would be necessary, before the Protestant and Catholic population could be equalized, to expatriate four-fifths of the Irish people. I need not dwell upon this absurd and atrocious proposal. The feelings of human nature, and the love of kindred, and the attachment to his native fields, are as lively in the heart of the poor man as in the bosom of the rich; and the humble hearth of the peasant is as dear to his soul, as the hall of the Baron, or the palace of the King, to their proud possessors. Would the Irish people even submit to be transported from the land of their fathers, the wealth of England could not effect it. The only true plan for ameliorating the condition of Ireland, is to unite, by equal laws, the entire of the people in defence of their common rights; the state of society must be wretched, indeed, when the only method of remedy is to tear from the country the nerves and the sinews of the soil. I have

heard it urged, moreover, that the concession of the Catholic claims would lead to the overthrow of the Established Church; and that, therefore, the Ministers of that Church are opposed to your rights. I am not the enemy of the Established Church; but, if I were, I could wish for no surer way of subjecting it to hatred and obloquy, than to represent it as the constant barrier in the way of the people's rights. Though a few Clergymen of that Church, however, have lately exhibited a hostility towards you, unbecoming their situation as men and Christian Ministers, I believe the majority of that body, to be peaceful, faithful, and useful Ministers of the Gospel. For my own part, I feel I am in my duty in coming forward to-day to add my name and influence, humble as they are, to the peaceable and constitutional efforts which my countrymen and fellow-Christians are making to recover those rights of which they have so long been unjustly deprived. I would not, to inherit the wealthiest living of the wealthiest Church in Christendom, forego the cheer with which I was greeted, and the feelings it excited, when I approached this altar to-day. I have spoken and acted as my conscience dictated. Whether I have consulted my interest by what I have done, I neither know nor care. I have only one consideration—to do my duty faithfully—and in the cause of truth, of justice, and of liberty, to "cry aloud and spare not."

At the public dinner, which was afterwards held, the Catholic Bishop presided, and, on his health being proposed by Mr. Montgomery, Dr. Crolly thus spoke,

"I have never willingly, in the course of my whole life, done an injury to any human creature. I am aware, that the religion I profess, obliges me to observe charity towards every other creed; it teaches me that man is the image of God; and so long as that image remains stamped on the creature, so long must I esteem him as the first object in the eyes of my Heavenly Father. It has been my good fortune to be placed in a portion of the empire, where I daily see the principles of that charity admirably dispensed. In regard to religious charity, the head of the Church to which I belong, has given frequent proofs of his support of that principle. In the Pope's dominions, we find him the protector of the rights of the Protestants, both civil and religious, as well as the Catholics. I should be sorry that the same principle would not prevail at home; and I cannot but believe that more liberal principles will soon pervade every denomination in these countries; the principles which direct us, "to love God above all things, and our neighbour as ourselves." And, I should be glad to know where any man would get a good argument against this principle. I should be glad to know what injury the Established, or the Presbyterian Church would receive, if it possessed more members like those to my right and left? *Good Christians, of every denomination, hold pretty nearly the same views on all matters of a moral nature;* and I should never wish to see speculative points interfere with the principles of Christian benevolence."

Catholic Emancipation.

No one public occurrence has ever given us more heartfelt joy, than the promised settlement of this important question. We hail it as a measure of justice, of national honour, of Christian benevolence. We are satisfied it will do more to promote the real welfare, prosperity, and harmony of our country, than any measure which could at present be adopted. That there are others who hold different sentiments we know, and we lament. Opposition from some individuals is necessarily to be expected to any thing that is liberal, and there are quarters supported by legal buttresses, and based on mystery and uncharitableness, into which the light of knowledge will be last to penetrate. But, still, its beams are diffusing, "Gentiles have come to its light, and Kings to the brightness of its rising;" and, as "the school-master is abroad," and the Scriptures are disseminated far and wide, we still hope to see the time when all shall acknowledge it to be a duty "to do to others as they would wish others to do to them."

In the meantime, the bigots of all denominations are alarmed, and in this "Metropolis of the West," as its citizens sometimes fondly call it, but, as it has been as accurately entitled, "one of the darkest dens of Calvinism," the efforts to excite the popular feeling against "the Romans" have been most strenuous. In our last Number, we noticed the meeting of the Presbytery, and the shameful treatment which the advocates of Christian justice and charity experienced. The feeling exhibited in that Reverend assembly has been warmly imitated. In the General Session of Glasgow, composed of Ministers and Elders of the different churches, and, which the leading "Agitator" has named, "the *constituted* guardians of the religious liberties of the people in the second City of the Empire for population and importance," most extraordinary assertions have been made. One Elder called on his brethren to oppose Concession, because, if it were granted, they would soon be obliged to celebrate the Lord's Supper in "coal cellars!" We have heard of the ruling passion strong in death, but here, it is evident, that the Elder's *business* prompted this flight of oratory, as tasteful as it is true. The Rev. Patrick M'Farlane of St. Enoch's, and those few who thought with him, presented their reasons of dissent against the decision of the meeting, reasons which do them honour, and which have been attempted to be answered, how feebly and impotently we need not say, by the Rev. John Muir of St. James's, the leader in the forlorn hope of intolerance. Lord Winchelsea's Letter has been distributed by this party, with great assiduity, and copies of it placarded, with various other incitements to intolerant feeling.

The Editor of this Magazine immediately prepared a Petition in behalf of universal religious freedom, and a place was engaged for the convenience of those wishing to sign. A crowd, however, was speedily excited by a hired agent, the place closed by the Police, and the individual who had the charge of it, knocked down and kicked on the public street. Application was the next day made to the Police; but all adequate protection was refused. The

shop was again opened; but, in a few hours, the populace entered it, tore the petition, and again it was closed. Yesterday, Feb. 20, assurance having been given, that no disturbance would be allowed, and police-officers being stationed to keep the peace, another effort was made to give the inhabitants an opportunity of expressing their opinions. But still the crowd gathered, every individual signing was exposed to abuse, several were severely injured, and in the afternoon the landlord requested the place might be shut up, as his property was in danger; and the Sitting Magistrate advised the same measure, accompanying it with the intimation, that if any riot ensued, he would hold those who had prepared the Petition responsible for the consequences. Of course, the place is closed. Apt illustration of Protestant ascendancy—appropriate specimen of that peaceful and charitable spirit so opposite to Popish virulence and Catholic bigotry! No attempt has been made by the Exclusionists, to stay this disgraceful feeling; they content themselves with having raised the storm, and are, we suppose, indifferent to the consequences, so that themselves are safe.

Notwithstanding these outrages, and the peril to which those were exposed who sanctioned the prayer of charity and liberty, and although the Petition only lay for signature altogether but a few hours, many hundred signatures were attached, and these not of children, but of numbers of the most intelligent inhabitants of the City.

The inconsistency of Presbyterians coming forward to support Prelacy, we pointed out before. It can scarcely be exceeded in folly, excepting by professed *Independents*, forming part of a Committee to uphold a Presbyterian Church. Bigotry, like poverty, brings people acquainted with strange companions. In spite of the facts, that Trial by Jury, Magna Charta, and various statutes enacted against the encroachments of the See of Rome, were the results of the wisdom and the love of freedom cherished by our Catholic ancestors—in spite of the facts, that the hallowed names to Scotia dear, of Bruce and Wallace, are enrolled in the Catholic communion—in spite of the facts, that the persecution which deluged Scotland with blood, was the work of the Church of England, and not of Rome, and that, by the Covenant, its subscribers are bound to extirpate Prelacy—in spite of the facts, that when a body of Highlanders were brought to Glasgow, to force the Liturgy and Prelacy on the people of this City, and allowed free quarters, and consequently indulged in all manner of excesses, those Presbyterians who were most exposed to the atrocities which were perpetrated, emigrated to Ireland, were received with open arms and warm hearts by the Catholics of that country,—in spite of such notorious truths, do the descendants of men thus persecuted by the English Church, now come forward in its defence, raising the howl of intolerance, and strengthening the hands of an Establishment rioting on the spoils of the needy, and paralyzing every effort made to raise the moral and intellectual character of Ireland, and to give peace and freedom to her long oppressed and afflicted people.

THE

CHRISTIAN PIONEER.

No. 32. APRIL, 1829. Vol. III.

"As is the Mother, so is her Daughter."

THAT the Christian Religion is founded on a rock, and that the gates even of death shall not prevail against it, is a sentiment, the truth of which every individual professing to be a disciple of Jesus Christ, most willingly acknowledges. It was the declaration of its Author and Finisher, and from his decision, there is, to the Christian, no appeal. Other expressions confirmatory of the same opinion, also proceeded from the lips of the Saviour. "My kingdom is not of this world. If my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight; but now my kingdom is not from hence." In this passage, any alliance with the civil power is distinctly disclaimed. The kingdom of the Son of God—that kingdom which is righteousness, and peace, and joy—was not to be advanced by the policy of earthly rulers, nor were its principles to be disseminated in consequence of the protection of worldly governments. Christ's empire was indeed to become universal, but it was to be the empire of reason, not of force; synonymous with the prevalence of liberty, not of despotism over conscience; productive of the virtue and happiness of human kind, not of the prostration of the understanding and will before an earthborn hierarchy. Christ's kingdom was not to come with observation, with pomp, and ceremony, and show: he was to reign in the soul, and to govern the affections and the thoughts of his disciples. The unbeliever was not to be turned from the error of his way, by the use of the brand, or the employment of the faggot: the censures of pontifical, or kingly, or synodical authority, were not authorized means in deterring human beings from inquiry; nor were the curses of contradictory creeds to wither the efforts of the humble advocate of common sense. Directly opposed to such iniquitous assumptions, is the entire language and conduct of the Christian legislator—the inflexible defender of the people's rights against the claims of the Scribe, and the Priest, and the Pharisee—of him who was emphatically the poor man's friend. "The

princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion, and they that are great exercise authority upon them, but it shall not be so amongst you." No civil authority shall interpose the secular arm in the affairs of the kingdom, which I am appointed by the God of mercy to establish. This may be, and indeed is, the prevailing practice—the princes determine the faith of the multitude, and mental bondage is consequently their portion; they that are great exercise authority upon their followers and bondmen, but it shall not be so among you. One is your Father, even God, and all ye are brethren. The great and all-important doctrine of the paternal character of the Almighty, is revealed; all nations are his offspring, the whole human race is but one family, equal in the regards of the all-merciful and all-wise Being, who gave them life, and pours forth blessings; and perfect equality of rights and privileges is, therefore, the birthright of rational and regenerated man. There is neither barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free, but all are one in Christ.

These declarations, harmonizing as they do with the voice of nature and the teachings of reason, are the charter of the liberty of the children of God; they are the Christian's freehold of rejoicing both to himself and his heirs for ever. There may be, unfortunately there are, those who would part with these blessings—this sacred inheritance of freedom, from negligence, from indifference, from pleas of expediency, from a desire of unanimity, crying peace, peace, where there exists not, where there ought not to exist, peace. There may others be discovered who would sell their hallowed privileges, if not for a mess of pottage, at least for that which is its equivalent, who would "take an oath and subscribe slave," for a place of misnamed honour; but no fearless and really upright and consistent Christian, would abandon his station as one of the freedmen of the Lord, and submit his reason to be hoodwinked, and his intellect to be bound down, at the command of creatures as frail and fallible as himself. No: Christianity is a religion of reason, of light, of liberty, of purity, and of peace; the service of God is a service of perfect freedom; righteous conduct, is benevolence to man; acceptable worship, that which is offered in spirit and in truth. Conscience is amenable to no human law, nor is it cognizable by any human tribunal. Though all carnal weapons, in the propagation of what he deems truth, be

denied to the Christian, by the express commandments of that law, he reverences and obeys, yet has he the far superior instruments, "etherial tempered" of argument, persuasion and Scripture; and he has, for his encouragement in their steady and persevering employment, the assurance of an Apostle, that these will prove mighty through God, in destroying the strongholds of wickedness and superstition, and in bringing every thought into obedience to the anointed of Heaven.

Such do we conceive to be the view which Christianity exhibits of that freedom from domination in matters of religion, in which the disciples were earnestly exhorted to stand fast. Such we think to be the description of that emancipation from the authority of lords many, and the worship of gods many, which is proclaimed in the Scriptures of salvation. No more to be entangled in the yoke of bondage, but to be strong, and to quit themselves like men, were the manly and solemn exhortations which the Apostles addressed to the first Christian disciples. And whilst these sentiments and feelings prevailed in the minds and hearts of the followers of Him who came to preach deliverance to the captives, then daily were added unto the church such as should be saved—then the Gospel went forth conquering and to conquer, so mightily grew the Word of God and prevailed. It was not the sight of the triple crown, nor the command of an earthly potentate, that caused the triumphant success of the Christian doctrines: it was the perfect simplicity of those doctrines, and the moral loveliness and purity of the precepts of that holy covenant. It was not the purple and the fine linen, nor the flowing robes, nor the lawn-sleeved arm of the lordly Prelate, which converted the three thousand on the day of Pentecost, which made Felix tremble, and Agrippa almost persuaded—it was the plainness and sincerity of one Apostle, and the boldness and eloquence of his companion in faith and tribulation. The pomps and vanities of this wicked world, were not the motives which induced the inhabitants of the various countries through which Paul of Tarsus travelled, to desert the temples of idolatry, and to take up their cross as disciples of the despised and crucified Nazarene. It was neither interest, nor interest-begotten prejudice, which compelled the citizens of Athens to renounce the worship of the unknown God, for the adoration of Him who fills immensity with his presence.

Higher and nobler motives prompted their faith and their obedience. Scarlet and gold would not have won their homage, for they left both the temple of Diana, and the interested and crafty shrine-maker. The fact was, they could not resist the majesty of truth; their hearts were warmed by the moral beauty which the Gospel presented to their imaginations, and liberty of thought, and benevolence of feeling, gladdened them in their onward march under the Christian banner. Then was Christianity justified by having free course, not only without any assistance from those gods of this world who die like men, but in direct opposition to their wishes, and in utter defiance of their commands. Though pains and penalties, persecution, bonds, and imprisonment, awaited the promulgators of the new and unpopular doctrines, yet fearless in their Master's cause—a cause which they were assured was the precursor of the virtue, the improvement, the present and eternal happiness of their fellow-creatures—forth they went, rejoicing that they were accounted worthy to suffer, what those engaged in the world's mad business, its pleasures, and its idolatry, deemed shame, for the sake of Jesus. The kings of the earth stood up, and the rulers were gathered together, to silence the expression of the sentiments they advocated, and to crush the rising interests of the cross; but this was nought to them, they ceased not to teach and to preach Jesus Christ. And, therefore, was it, that their enemies had reason to complain, that they filled Jerusalem with their doctrine, and that the whole world went after them. The more the disciples of Jesus were afflicted, the more they multiplied and grew.

The Apostles were at length called to finish their earthly career, through the violence, generally, of their inveterate and bigotted opponents, but not until the great Apostle of Christianity had left on record the ever-memorable prophecy, 2 Thess. ii. 3, "Let no man deceive you by any means, for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition, who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped, so that he, as God, sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God." "For the mystery of inquity doth already work." "And then shall that wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming, even him

whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all power, and signs, and lying wonders." In Paul's Epistles to Timothy, similar intimations are given: 1 Tim. iv. 1, "Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times, some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils." "Forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving, of them which believe and know the truth." In the letters of the beloved disciple, occur many strong expressions regarding the anti-christian opinions and practices, which would become prevalent, and which, even at the period in which the Apostle wrote, had commenced their unrighteous progress: 1 John iv. 2, "Hereby know ye the Spirit of God. Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is of God; and every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is not of God,—and this is that spirit of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come, and even now already is it in this world." It is, however, to the book of the Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him, and which was reported by John, that we must look for the full delineation of the forthcoming apostacy: Rev. xvii. 3, "I saw a woman sit upon a scarlet-coloured beast, full of names of blasphemy, having seven heads and ten horns. And the woman was arrayed in purple and scarlet colour, and decked with gold and precious stones and pearls, having a golden cup in her hand, full of abominations and filthiness of her fornication, and upon her forehead was a name written—Mystery, Babylon the Great, the mother of harlots, and abominations of the earth." The same chapter also declares, that the influence of falsehood, and mystery, and tyranny, shall extend over multitudes, and nations, and tongues, and that it should prevail over the kings of the earth.

These were the visions of future events, which passed before the minds of those indefatigable votaries of truth and righteousness; and too speedily were their predictions verified. The antichristian feelings and prejudices, which even previously to the death of the venerable John, had manifested their pernicious power, when the sacred guardians of the infant cause were removed from the world, rapidly spread. Individuals who had, in past days, indulged in the vain illusions of earthly philosophy, unable

to gainsay the evidences by which the religion of Jesus was accompanied, and loath, at the same time, to renounce their former opinions, endeavoured to unite them with its holy dictates. Fanciful illustrations and comparisons led the way to abstruse and metaphysical doctrines, which, whilst they confused the wise, kept in awe the ignorant. The lovers of ceremony, the votaries of rites and pageantry, aided the unhallowed amalgamation. The powers which be, from despising the professors of the "new Superstition," as they calumniously styled the Christian faith, came to perceive, that under the different aspect it was assuming, it might be advantageously employed in upholding civil authority, and strengthening the hands of military despotism. "In the first four centuries, in fact, doctrinal corruption and ecclesiastical domination, advanced hand in hand; together were they born, together did they revel on human sacrifices, and together, for such is the declaration of prophecy, will they perish. The same malignant star ruled at their nativity, and the same triumphal shout shall peal the glad tidings of their destruction around the enlightened and liberated globe."

The conversion of Constantine, the Roman Emperor, to the *profession* of Christianity, (are we authorized to say, belief?) by beholding, so he declared, a miraculous cross in the heavens, on which was the inscription, "By this shalt thou conquer," elevated the Christian system to the seat of imperial power. Is it too much to affirm, that thus, the prediction of the "signs and lying wonders," was in part accomplished? Surely it would be the height of impiety to suppose, that the Father of mercies, the God of love, who, by the mouth of his well-beloved Son, had uttered his solemn condemnation of violence and outrage, even in that beloved one's defence, would exhibit even to a regal murderer, the symbol of the religion of peace, in order to urge him forward in the carnage of his rational offspring. We have not so learned Christ. No: there were other motives which induced this Emperor to avow himself a Christian believer,—motives more likely to sway the passions of an earthly ruler, and which led him to form the unholy alliance between the State and the Church. This unnatural connection was, however, effected, and corruption was speedily piled upon corruption: the son of perdition—despotism over conscience—was revealed, this authority became dominant above all that

is called God, or that is worshipped; the princes were bound in fetters, the nobles in chains, the people were bond slaves. Eventually, the ecclesiastical half of the alliance, like Aaron's rod, swallowed up all that was opposed to it, and the nations bowed to its supremacy. The darkness of superstition covered the earth, and the gross darkness of ecclesiastical tyranny, the people. The sun did, indeed, stand still upon Gibeon, and the moon in the valley of Ajalon.

But this spiritual slavery could not last for ever. The mental lethargy was broken, the times of Reformation came, the day-star of liberty again appeared in the heavens, the human mind burst its searments, and issued forth like a strong man after sleep. Strong and vigorous were the attacks made on the proud edifice of idolatry and priest-craft; and, in the language of the inscription represented as placed on the tomb of one of the earliest and most enlightened of the Reformers, "Luther took off the roof of the building of Babylon, Calvin threw down the walls, but Socinus dug up the foundations." It was with the spirit of the two former of these that England took part, and upon which she formed her ecclesiastical polity. It is worthy of inquiry, whether, in unroofing the ancient structure, very nearly the same materials were not used in rearing the more modern superstructure. Let us see whether there be not some truth in the old proverb, "As is the Mother, so is her Daughter." The modern Episcopalian, or Protestant, as he calls himself, is very fond of ridiculing the faith, and ritual, and practices of a member of the Church of Rome; ay, and he presumes to despise him, too, on account of his creed and observances, and would make them the reasons for debarring him from his civil rights, and from a participation in the privileges and honours of the state. We shall endeavour to ascertain, whether or not, instead of contending with each other, and falling out by the way, there do not appear a most striking resemblance of feature, which goes far to prove, that they are, in truth, closely allied members of the same family.

(To be Continued.)

LETTER VI.

Of the Manifestation of Jesus to two Disciples, and his Disappearance from them.

The utter incredulity of the disciples of Jesus as to his resurrection, till it was brought fully home to their senses and understandings, is evident from every circumstance in the evangelical narratives relating to it. Their concurrence in committing him to the tomb, when he was delivered up to their disposal, with the great pains and expense they were at in preparations for his obsequies, as also the length of their stay at Jerusalem, are decisive proofs that they understood nothing of his prediction concerning that event, nor, consequently, of his going before them into Gallilee. The successive messages by the women, reminding them of these predictions, and declaring their accomplishment, failed, in the first instance, of producing any favourable impressions on their minds. They purported, indeed, to proceed from the voice of angels, and of Jesus himself, and had certainly wrought an entire change in the minds of their female friends, whose incredulity appears to have fully equalled their own; but such unexpected and marvellous intelligence, however gratifying, and countenanced by the removal of the stone and the disappearance of the body, was too dissonant from that despondency into which they had been thrown by the equally unexpected catastrophe of his ignominious and cruel death; and at present they regarded them only as "idle tales," undeserving of credit.

Much discussion and inquiry was, however, excited; as appeared in two of the disciples, who, in going from Jerusalem to Emmaus on the same day, "talked together of all those things that had happened." As they are thus "communing and reasoning," Jesus joins their company, and in the character of a stranger, draws from them a narrative which exhibits a natural picture of minds in a state of wonder and strong curiosity, but without having arrived at any definite conclusion. Continuing unknown to them, he censures their slowness in the understanding of those ancient prophecies that applied to his crucifixion and his "entrance into glory," and then goes on to a lengthened explication of those predictions. He is not known to

them till at supper, (probably dropping the manner of a stranger, and assuming his ordinary mode of preparing for a meal as master of the ceremonies,) their attention is particularly drawn upon his person. No sooner, however, have they recognised him, than "he vanished out of their sight;" or as it is rendered by Whitby, "became invisible to them."

Of this interview, it may be observed, that it is in two respects calculated to establish the resurrection of Jesus to a state of glory; first, by his own assurance, as confirmed by his interpretation of the ancient prophecies; and secondly, by his personal manifestation and transition into that state. His remaining so long unknown to these disciples, may seem somewhat extraordinary in men who appear to have been intimately acquainted with his person and manners; but it certainly shows that the meeting was totally unanticipated on their part, and the dimness of the light toward the evening, and the intense degree in which their attention was absorbed by the subjects of their conversation, with the absence of any expectation of meeting their recently crucified master in a stranger who appeared unacquainted with the fact, may sufficiently account for their ignorance. His miraculous disappearance immediately upon their recognising him, was an additional proof that the supposed stranger could be no other than Jesus, who, after manifesting himself to them in his ordinary capacity, was now, indeed, entered into his glory. If it be thought that his walking a considerable distance, and sitting in their company, was not a sufficient evidence of his corporeal presence, it may be replied, that nothing can be more manifest than that the uninteresting form of a *stranger*, could be no work of two imaginations at once, both of which were so intensely occupied by objects of a most interesting nature; nor could they have mutually dreamed, that this imaginary being, under the form of a stranger, had, by the interpretation of ancient prophecies, made them acquainted with an event which was strongly opposed to their previous conceptions, *viz.* that the "Messiah must suffer a cruel and ignominious death, and *thus* enter into his glory." Such conclusions as these could be no figments of the fancy, in two minds so fully occupied with different views; and could, therefore, only have been the effect of actual impressions and communications conformably to their statement. It was in perfect unison

with the preceding circumstances, that on a more attentive observation of the supposed stranger, when artificial light was probably thrown upon his person, and Jesus assumed his accustomed manner at supper, he should become known to them; and this disclosure being followed by his transit to an invisible state, confirmed all that he had been previously maintaining, that after "suffering such things," he should enter into celestial glory.

Commentators have, indeed, supposed that Jesus did not change his state of being, but only left the room, upon his being known to the disciples. But the sense of the Greek, αυτος αφαντος εγενετο απ' αυτων, is the rendering of Whitby, that "*he became invisible to them*," a circumstance which was the more remarkable, as their eyes were now "*opened* that they knew him." At the very moment when their organs of sight were most intensely fixed upon his person, and they had fully recognised him, he became invisible, entirely eluding their keenest powers of observation. The whole verse appears emphatically to express, that he was first fully made known to them through the medium of sight, and then as absolutely withdrawn from its powers of inspection. "Their eyes were opened, and they knew him; and he became invisible to them." Had he simply walked out in the ordinary manner, could they, with the intense interest they now beheld his person, have mistaken it for a transit into the invisible state? or would they, on so incidental an occasion, have used words expressive of an event so extraordinary and unexpected? It appears to be the manifest intention of the Evangelist, to convey the idea that their eyes having been long "*holden*" in a remarkable manner from recognising a person with whom they were well acquainted, and after whose fate they were inquiring with the liveliest interest, were now as remarkably "*opened*" to the knowledge of him; and that he, having thus fully revealed himself to their view, as manifestly passed into a state in which he could no longer be the object of sight. Had he attempted to leave them in the ordinary way, at so deeply interesting a moment, would not their friendly interference have been exerted to the utmost, to have prevented it? Or if we suppose their surprise at the discovery of his person, to have held them in suspense for a moment, would they not speedily have so far recovered their self-possession, as to follow with their desiring eyes

an object which had arrested all their thoughts and powers of observation? Instead of this, we merely find them communing upon what they had witnessed, and shortly after, resolving to go back to Jerusalem to acquaint the Apostles with the circumstances; plainly aware that their whole interview with Jesus was terminated.

The opinion we are considering, appears to have arisen out of the supposed difficulty attending the reconciling his proper corporeal presence with such a transition to invisibility. But where is the peculiar difficulty of supposing, that he was withdrawn from the ordinary observation of mortals at the very instant of his deliverance from the grave, when all Christians must admit, that he has been removed from their sight or knowledge, at least, from the period of his ascension to the present day? Do they not all agree that he was raised to die no more; and that, notwithstanding, he occasionally manifested himself to those who could best recognise his person in the state in which alone this was possible, that is, in the ordinary state of humanity, his corruptible body had put on incorruption; and though a convenient time was necessary between his resurrection and his final removal from mortal cognizance, for bringing the evidence of that event home to the conviction of suitable witnesses, yet it appears equally necessary, that its true nature, and the entire change which he had undergone, should be no less fully evinced. Certainly, a transition of the animal frame to an invisible state, is an event difficult of comprehension; but I know not with what consistency Christians can deny this to have been the ultimate change in the body of their master; as few, I apprehend, will imagine that he now retains a gross animal body. They must all admit that a very great and permanent change was effected in his body and ordinary mode of existence; and though the nature of that change cannot be fully comprehended by them at present, yet the circumstances of his *ordinary* removal from the observation of all persons after his resurrection, and of his returning to that state, as described by the Evangelist, are well calculated to evince the reality of such a change. We are, indeed, unable to conceive how an animal frame can be rendered invisible, and yet retain its functions, or have them greatly elevated and improved, so as to render them the instrumental cause of higher vitality; yet, while we trace the operations of an invisible

power every where around us, in the production of the most admirable effects, we cannot, surely, doubt that the existence of *such* an invisible nature is within the bounds of possibility. It being also a most interesting circumstance to mankind in this state, to see the great change which awaits them when they pass into their future existence, in a manner exemplified by their "great leader into glory," it appeared expedient, that he should not only be seen in his animal nature, but should give evidence of that spiritual state to which he has attained, in a manner alike frequent and satisfactory. This was the first instance of his so evidently passing into the invisible state; but it entirely corresponds with his disappearance from the sepulchre, and with the occasional and transitory nature of all his appearances from that period. HOMO.

To the Editor of the Christian Pioneer.

Mr. EDITOR,

IT is a painful circumstance to the sincere Christian—to the fearless inquirer after truth, to witness, as is sometimes the case, in men eminent for their learning, talents, and virtues, a lamentable deficiency of decision of character.

I have been led into my present train of reflections, from a perusal of the correspondence between your able correspondent G. C. S. and yourself, in some preceding numbers of the Christian Pioneer, on some points in the character of the late Dr. Parr. I am inclined to think that, in substance, there is little, if any, difference between your correspondent and yourself. G. C. S. is enamoured, as who cannot but be, with the display of erudition and the extent of benevolence, so beautifully delineated by my friend Mr. Field. G. C. S., in a most amiable spirit, is prone to look more at the bright than the dark sides of human character. You, Sir, I am ready to believe, possessing in no inferior degree, the admirable spirit of Christian benevolence, cannot make any compromise with insincerity.

G. C. S. says of the learned Doctor, "I rejoice that he was what he was—better he might have been; but, if we are to wait for perfection before we praise, the example of the wise and good will be lost, and their influence will

die away in the day that they perish. Once more, I say, I wish he had left the Church; but for not doing so, I dare not condemn him."

In these sentiments, I cannot fully coincide. Without waiting for perfection, surely it is allowable to descant upon the failings as well as the virtues in human character. I think great advantage may be derived from forming a true estimate of character, and more particularly from minutely weighing the actions of individuals who have acted a more prominent part on the theatre of life. In such a pursuit, to dwell only on the excellences, and to throw a veil of oblivion over, or to become the apologist of the faults of the individual, may accord with the trite but erroneous maxim, "*nil nisi bonum de mortuis.*" Will it, however, tend as powerfully to enforce a love of integrity, of morality, of sterling virtue, as when the whole character is fairly laid open and discussed? The impartial biographer, while he holds up the virtues of his characters as examples to survivors, omits not to expose their faults, their errors, and their vices, as beacons to warn the thoughtless and inconsiderate from falling into similar snares. In Scripture history, the errors and the crimes of David and of Peter are not concealed because they possessed many virtues.

While, therefore, I see much, very much, in the character of Dr. Parr to admire, to love, to venerate, and respect, yet, for insincerity I cannot approve—I must condemn him. Undoubtedly, much ought to be conceded to a man's education, his prejudices, his situation, and connections in life; and, when we see the venerable Lindsey for a time continuing in connexion with a Church whose doctrines he condemned, and apologising for so doing by arguments which satisfied his own mind, though with us they possess not the same weight and influence, we cannot but condemn with caution and timidity. But the veil which for a season obscured the judgment of the honest Lindsey, was soon dispelled. This magnanimous Confessor ultimately burst asunder the flimsy ties which bound him in communion with a Church, whose worship he declared to be idolatrous. This honest, upright conclusion of his doubts and uncertainties, stamps his character for sincerity. This truly noble and magnanimous emancipation of himself, throws a spell over the sophistry which had held him in bondage, and claims, at the hands of

Christian charity, the forgiveness of his error. Very different, however, would have been our estimate of the man, had he died within the pale of that Church, whose doctrines, ceremonies, and discipline, he believed to be antichristian. The noble act of secession constitutes the marked difference between a Lindsey and a Parr.

In reflecting on the character of each, be it ours to derive the most salutary instruction—to learn the intrinsic value of consistency and integrity, and to say with the highly respected memorialist of the great confessor Lindsey, "Every man has not the firmness of a Luther or a Lindsey; and to his own master must every one stand or fall." Integrity of principle, and consistency of conduct, are essential to the formation of a great character. They are the indispensable requisites of "an Israelite indeed, in whom is no guile." Contempt always attaches to the man, whose profession and whose practice correspond not with each other. Human judgment, which is unable to enter into the motives which influence the conduct of others, is apt to attribute to pusillanimity or hypocrisy, the inconsistencies which are prevalent in the world, and which occasionally tarnish the lustre emanating from the wisest and the best of mankind. Either of these brands of opprobrium (and it is difficult to separate them), are hateful and contemptible. On the contrary, who does not admire genuine undisguised sincerity, even in the man whose opinions we believe to be erroneous. Sincerity is the bond which links society together. It is the basis of confidence, the parent of affection, the originator of esteem. In the absence of this virtue, distrust, jealousy, and suspicion must prevail in the intercourse between man and man. If sincerity be of such importance in the transactions of human society, how much is its importance increased in the relations of man with his Maker, in public worship, and in the profession of religion? Insincerity here rises to the highest point of enormity. It is insulting the Supreme Object of worship, and highly prejudicial to the cause of Christ. What are we compelled to think of the man, who reads from his desk, before an assembly of worshipping Christians, that tissue of absurdity and impiety, the Athanasian Creed, and at the same time apologises for the act, that he does it by command, and confesses its absurdity and impiety? With what utter contempt must the parishioners of Hatton have listened, in the "bidding

prayer," to supplications for blessings on the head of a persecuted and oppressed Queen, while, in the preceding service, her name or title had been omitted, in slavish compliance with the mandate of authority? The man who could thus tamely stoop to do what his conscience must have condemned, cannot be ranked with the honest Nathanael.

It is true, that Dr. Parr, on many occasions, magnanimously asserted his opinions; and as G. C. S. observes, "had he been among those who cannot afford to keep a conscience, he would have sat upon the Episcopal Bench, and, perhaps, enjoyed the proudest honours of the hierarchy." But this only demonstrates his unsteadiness in the fearless assertion of his opinions. Had he acted to the full extent of his principles, he would honestly have abandoned a Church whose doctrines he disbelieved, and have torn himself from the shackles imposed by a hierarchy which he grossly insulted, by opposing the creeds of the one and the orders of the other, while, at the same time, he outwardly professed his belief in, and attachment to, both. Had the learned Doctor, like another Lindsey, honestly confessed himself a dissenter from that Church, whose emoluments, small as they were, he was enjoying, while he actually dissented from her creed, he would have added to his name a lustre more splendid than his gigantic learning alone can confer. He would have done religion a mighty service. He would, in a most important sense, have aided the cause of truth and virtue. P. H.

Dr. Channing's Discourse in Providence, Rhode Island.

(Concluded from page 226.)

My views on the great subject of this discourse have now been given. I shall close with a brief consideration of a few objections, in the course of which I shall offer some views of the Christian ministry, which this occasion and the state of the world, seem to me to demand. I anticipate from some an objection to this discourse, drawn, as they will say, from experience. I may be told, that I have talked of the godlike capacities of human nature, and have spoken of man as a divinity; and where, it will be asked, are the warrants of this high estimate of our race? I may be told that I dream, and that I have peopled the world

with the creatures of my lonely imagination. What! Is it only in dreams, that beauty and loveliness have beamed on me from the human countenance, that I have heard tones of kindness, which have thrilled through my heart, that I have found sympathy in suffering, and a sacred joy in friendship? Are all the great and good men of past ages only dreams? Are such names as Moses, Socrates, Paul, Alfred, Milton, only the fictions of my disturbed slumbers? Are the great deeds of history, the discoveries of philosophy, the creations of genius, only visions? Oh! no. I do not dream when I speak of the divine capacities of human nature. It was a real page in which I read of patriots and martyrs, of Fenelon and Howard, of Hampden and Washington. And tell me not that these were prodigies, miracles, immeasurably separated from their race; for their very reverence, which has treasured up and hallowed their memories, the very sentiments of admiration and love with which their names are now heard, show that the principles of their greatness are diffused through all your breasts. The germs of sublime virtue are scattered liberally on our earth. How often have I seen in the obscurity of domestic life, a strength of love, of endurance, of pious trust, of virtuous resolution, which in a public sphere would have attracted public homage. I cannot but pity the man, who recognises nothing godlike in his own nature. I see the marks of God in the heavens and the earth; but how much more in a liberal intellect, in magnanimity, in unconquerable rectitude, in a philanthropy which forgives every wrong, and which never despairs of the cause of Christ and human virtue. I do and I must reverence human nature. Neither the sneers of a worldly scepticism, nor the groans of a gloomy theology, disturb my faith in its godlike powers and tendencies. I know how it is despised, how it has been oppressed, how civil and religious establishments have for ages conspired to crush it. I know its history. I shut my eyes on none of its weaknesses and crimes. I understand the proofs, by which despotism demonstrates, that man is a wild beast, in want of a master, and only safe in chains. But injured, trampled on, and scorned, as our nature is, I still turn to it with intense sympathy and strong hope. The signatures of its origin and its end are impressed too deeply to be ever wholly effaced. I bless it for its kind affections, for its strong and tender love. I honour it for

its struggles against oppression, for its growth and progress under the weight of so many chains and prejudices, for its achievements in science and art, and still more for its examples in heroic and saintly virtue. These are marks of a divine origin and the pledges of a celestial inheritance; and I thank God that my own lot is bound up with that of the human race.

But another objection starts up. It may be said, "allow these views to be true; are they fitted for the pulpit? fitted to act on common minds? They may be prized by men of cultivated intellect and taste; but can the multitude understand them? Will the multitude feel them? On whom has a minister to act? On men immersed in business, and buried in the flesh; on men, whose whole power of thought has been spent on pleasure or gain; on men chained by habit, and wedded to sin. Sooner may adamant be riven by a child's touch, than the human heart be pierced by refined and elevated sentiment. Gross instruments will alone act on gross minds. Men sleep, and nothing but thunder—nothing but flashes from the everlasting fire of hell, will thoroughly wake them."

I have all along felt that such objections would be made to the views I have urged. But they do not move me. I answer, that I think these views singularly adapted to the pulpit, and I think them full of power. The objection is, that they are *refined*. But I see God accomplishing his noblest purposes by what may be called refined means. All the great agents of nature, attraction, heat, and the principle of life, are refined, spiritual, invisible, acting gently, silently, imperceptibly; and yet brute matter feels their power, and is transformed by them into surpassing beauty. The electric fluid, unseen, unfelt, and every where diffused, is infinitely more efficient, and ministers to infinitely nobler productions, than when it breaks forth in thunder. Much less can I believe, that in the moral world, noise, menace, and violent appeals to gross passions, to fear and selfishness, are God's chosen means of calling forth spiritual life, beauty, and greatness. It is seldom that human nature throws off all susceptibility of grateful and generous impressions, all sympathy with superior virtue; and here are springs and principles to which a generous teaching, if simple, sincere, and fresh from the soul, may confidently appeal.

It is said, men cannot *understand* the views which

seem to me so precious. This objection I am anxious to repel, for the common intellect has been grievously kept down and wronged through the belief of its incapacity. The pulpit would do more good, were not the mass of men looked upon and treated as children. Happily for the race, the time is passing away in which intellect was thought the monoply of a few, and the majority were given over to hopeless ignorance. Science is leaving her solitudes to enlighten the multitude. How much more may religious teachers take courage to speak to men on subjects, which are nearer to them than the properties and laws of matter, I mean their own souls. The multitude, you say, want capacity to receive the great truths relating to their spiritual nature. But what, let me ask you, is the Christian Religion? A spiritual system, intended to turn men's minds upon themselves, to frame them to watchfulness over thought, imagination, and passion, to establish them in an intimacy with their own souls. What are all the Christian virtues, which men are exhorted to love and seek? I answer, pure and high motions or determinations of the mind. That refinement of thought, which, I am told, transcends the common intellect, belongs to the very essence of Christianity. In confirmation of these views, the human mind seems to me to be turning itself more and more inward, and to be growing more alive to its own worth, and its capacities of progress. The spirit of education shows this, and so does the spirit of freedom. There is a spreading conviction that man was made for a higher purpose than to be a beast of burden, or a creature of sense. The divinity is stirring within the human breast, and demanding a culture and a liberty worthy of the child of God. Let religious teaching correspond to this advancement of the mind. Let it rise above the technical, obscure, and frigid theology, which has come down to us from times of ignorance, superstition, and slavery. Let it penetrate the human soul, and reveal it to itself. No preaching, I believe, is so intelligible, as that which is true to human nature, and helps men to read their own spirits.

But the objection which I have stated, not only represents men as incapable of understanding, but still more of being moved, quickened, sanctified, and saved, by such views as I have given. If, by this objection, nothing more is meant, than that these views are not alone or of

themselves sufficient, I shall not dispute it; for true and glorious as they are, they do not constitute the whole truth, and I do not expect great moral effects from narrow and partial views of our nature. I have spoken of the godlike capacities of the soul. But other and very different elements enter into the human being. Man has animal propensities as well as intellectual and moral powers. He has a body as well as mind. He has passions to war with reason, and self-love with conscience. He is a free being and a tempted being, and, thus constituted, he may and does sin, and often sins grievously. To such a being, religion or virtue, is a conflict, requiring great spiritual effort, put forth in habitual watchfulness and prayer; and all the motives are needed, by which force and constancy may be communicated to the will. I exhort not the preacher, to talk perpetually of man as "made but a little lower than the angels." I would not narrow him to any class of topics. Let him adapt himself to our whole and various nature. Let him summon to his aid, all the powers of this world, and the world to come. Let him bring to bear on the conscience and the heart, God's milder and more awful attributes, the promises and threatenings of the divine word, the lessons of history, the warnings of experience. Let the wages of sin here and hereafter, be taught clearly and earnestly. But amidst the various motives to spiritual effort, which belong to the minister, none are more quickening than those drawn from the soul itself, and from God's desire and purpose to exalt it, by every aid consistent with its freedom. These views, I conceive, are to mix with all others, and without them all others fail to promote a generous virtue. Is it said, that the minister's proper work is, to preach Christ, and not the dignity of human nature? I answer, that Christ's greatness is manifested in the greatness of the nature which he was sent to redeem; and that his chief glory consists in this, that he came to restore God's image where it was obscured or effaced, and to give an everlasting impulse and life to what is divine within us. Is it said, that the malignity of sin is to be the minister's great theme? I answer, that this malignity can only be understood and felt, when sin is viewed as the ruin of God's noblest work, as darkening a light brighter than the sun, as carrying discord, bondage, disease, and death, into a mind framed for perpetual progress towards

its Author. Is it said, that terror is the chief instrument of saving the soul? I answer, that if by terror be meant a rational and moral fear, a conviction and dread of the unutterable evil incurred by a mind which wrongs, betrays, and destroys itself, then I am the last to deny its importance. But a fear like this, which regards the debasement of the soul as the greatest of evils, is plainly founded upon and proportioned to our conceptions of the greatness of our nature. The more common terror, excited by vivid images of torture and bodily pain, is a very questionable means of virtue. When strongly awakened, it generally injures the character, breaks men into cowards and slaves, brings the intellect to cringe before human authority, makes man abject before his Maker, and, by a natural reaction of the mind, often terminates in a presumptuous confidence, altogether distinct from virtuous self-respect, and singularly hostile to the unassuming, charitable spirit of Christianity. The preacher should rather strive to fortify the soul against physical pains, than to bow it to their mastery, teaching it to dread nothing in comparison with sin, and to dread sin as the ruin of a noble nature.

Men, I repeat it, are to be quickened and raised by appeals to their highest principles. Even the convicts of a prison may be touched by kindness, generosity, and especially by a tone, look, and address, expressing hope and respect for their nature. I know, that the doctrine of ages has been, that terror, restraint, and bondage, are the chief safeguards of human virtue and peace. But we have begun to learn, that affection, confidence, respect, and freedom, are mightier as well as nobler agents. Men *can* be wrought upon by generous influences. I would that this truth were better understood by religious teachers. From the pulpit generous influences too seldom proceed. In the church, men too seldom hear a voice to quicken and exalt them. Religion, speaking through her public organs, seems often to forget her natural tone of elevation. The character of God, the principles of his government, his relations to the human family, the purposes for which he brought us into being, the nature which he has given us, and the condition in which he has placed us, these and the like topics, though the sublimest which can enter the mind, are not unfrequently so set forth as to narrow and degrade the hearers, disheartening and oppressing with gloom the timid and sensitive, and infecting coarser

minds with the unhallowed spirit of intolerance, presumption, and exclusive pretension to the favour of God. I know, and rejoice to know, that preaching in its worst forms does good; for so bright and piercing is the light of Christianity, that it penetrates in a measure the thickest clouds in which men contrive to involve it. But that evil mixes with the good, I also know; and I should be unfaithful to my deep convictions, did I not say, that human nature requires for its elevation, more generous treatment from the teachers of religion.

I conclude with saying, let the minister cherish a reverence for his own nature. Let him never despise it even in its most forbidding forms. Let him delight in its beautiful and lofty manifestations. Let him hold fast, as one of the great qualifications for his office, a faith in the greatness of the human soul, that faith which looks beneath the perishing body, beneath the sweat of the labourer, beneath the rags and ignorance of the poor, beneath the vices of the sensual and selfish, and discerns in the depths of the soul a divine principle, a ray of the Infinite Light, which may yet break forth and "shine as the sun" in the kingdom of God. Let him strive to awaken in men a consciousness of the heavenly treasure within them, a consciousness of possessing what is of more worth than the outward universe. Let hope give life to all his labours. Let him speak to men, as to beings liberally gifted, and made for God. Let him always look round on a congregation, with the encouraging trust, that he has hearers prepared to respond to the simple, unaffected utterance of great truths, and to the noblest workings of his own mind. Let him feel deeply for those, in whom the divine nature is overwhelmed by the passions. Let him sympathize tenderly with those, in whom it begins to struggle, to mourn for sin, to thirst for a new life. Let him guide and animate to higher and diviner virtue, those in whom it has gained strength. Let him strive to infuse courage, enterprise, devout trust, and an inflexible will, into men's labours for their own perfection. In one word, let him cherish an unfaltering and growing faith in God as the Father and quickener of the human mind, and in Christ as its triumphant and immortal friend. That by such preaching he is to work miracles, I do not say. That he will rival in sudden and outward effects, what is wrought by the preachers of a low and terrifying theology, I do

not expect or desire. That all will be made better, I am far from believing. His office is to act on free beings, who, after all, must determine themselves; who have power to withstand all foreign agency; who are to be saved, not by mere preaching, but by their own prayers and toil. Still I believe, that such a minister will be a benefactor beyond all praise to the human soul. I believe, and know, that on those who will admit his influence, he will work deeply, powerfully, gloriously. His function is the sublimest under heaven; and his reward will be a growing power of spreading truth, virtue, moral strength, love, and happiness, without limit, and without end.

Dialogues on Religion.—No. 3.

T. Good morning. You cannot reproach me with absence, nor suspect me of coolness now.

A. No, indeed. I am myself perhaps to blame, for not returning your last visit. You have had a long walk. Will you take a chair? Have you any thing new to communicate?

T. No, except that I spent yesterday evening with an agreeable company of ladies.

A. Indeed! Well, you will get on now. You will be well tutored. You thought, when you had mastered the Trinity, you had no more to learn. But you had only made a beginning. We shall soon see what progress our new convert will make. The Trinity is only the first step. It is the test of docility. It is in Protestantism what Transubstantiation is in Popery. They show, that the mind is prostrate, prepared to swallow every other mystery, and submit to every imposition that fanaticism, superstition, or priestcraft can prescribe. Transubstantiation was adopted with that very view.

T. I acknowledge no such consequence.

A. To be sure: but you will find it. It would, indeed, be gross affectation to boggle at any other doctrine. After taking leave of your reason, you will meet with no difficulties. I see by your looks, that you are incredulous in this, though you can believe the Trinity; but after a few initiatory prayer meetings, love feasts, and petty coteries, you will find your faith or credulity wonderfully improved.

T. What do you mean by petty coteries?

A. Did not you tell me, you were at one last night? Your new mode of thinking will introduce you to new company, which will require a different style of conversation from what you have been used to. The mothers of our young ladies, when young themselves, were addressed as angels; but their daughters are content with the title of saints. I amuse myself with picturing the figure you will make in those parties, to which you will be immediately introduced, and hope you will favour me with an account of your progress. I fear you will be out of your element for a time. You will have to learn a new language from these masters and misses, and take lessons and lectures from the old ladies. At these parties, to which you will be invited with "to tea and the Rev. Mr. ——," or, "to breakfast and the Bible with Mr. ——," you will be obliged to swallow many things "bitter to swallow and hard of digestion." If you retain any of that true spirit of which you boast, I fear you will soon be cast out of the synagogue. These petticoat divines are as scrupulous and intolerant as any synod, and will excommunicate you in a whisper; and with the less remorse or ceremony, as being a married man; for these spiritual coteries often lead to very agreeable results. The young ladies often get pious husbands, and the preachers good fortunes and genteel connexions; while the parents repent of their negligence at their leisure. Have you read Mrs. Sherwood's works, and particularly her Lady of the Manor?

T. No; I never heard of her.

A. I wonder at that. She is a very pious lady, and evangelical; yet she could not refrain from amusing herself with those interesting conferences, and the solicitude of these "babes and sucklings" about the blooming young parson. You will find what I refer to, in the third volume of her *Lady of the Manor*, somewhere about the middle of the book. Mr. Burton, too, the parson, she represents as a clerical dandy, eternally complaining, or rather boasting, of the multiplicity of professional engagements, with which he is overwhelmed. I have heard of some, who carried this foppery into the pulpit; and displayed, at the same time, the elegance of their canonicals, and the exhaustion occasioned by their zealous declamation: both well calculated to excite the admiration and sympathy, and to call forth the tender inquiries and endearing attentions of their fair hearers.

I would advise you, who are but a novice, to get some preparatory instruction from your morning visitors, before you venture again among these female theologians; for they can solve high arguments that puzzled Milton's angels. They will put you through your Catechism; but Mrs. Sherwood has made this very easy and agreeable, by illustrating it with stories.

T. You have changed your ground; but I am not content to be relieved from your sarcasms, at the expense of the ladies; for I hold the character and conduct of the present race in the highest esteem. Whatever we have of true Christianity, we owe to their example and persuasions. Thousands of them will bear comparison with the women most celebrated in Scripture. Many of our matrons are entitled to that beautiful character at the end of Proverbs. We read of *one* Dorcas, but we have a thousand Clothing Societies; and those who can show "the coats and garments" they have made for the poor, are literally innumerable. In their zeal for religion, they rival those pious Christians whose names are recorded in the Epistles. Timothy's grandmother only instructed her own grandson in the Bible from a child, but it is the constant employment of our ladies to devote their time to the teaching of the poor, old and young, in hospitals, poor-houses, and charity-schools of every description; and in devotedness to the service of their Lord, they may vie with Martha, and the pious women, who attended upon him, and followed him to the Cross.

A. Why, my dear sir, you are grown quite eloquent in their praise; and I admire you the more for it, because you had so little to say for yourself. I agree with you in all that you have said, but you cannot require me to include the whole sex in that eulogium. Few of the higher classes, I fear, are entitled to it; but I am not at all disposed to differ from you, as to the general character of women. Our matrons are, I am sure, patterns to those of every other country, in manners, morals, and religion; but some of them are too ambitious to display these qualities, and their ambition often leads them to figure in public institutions. They band together in knots and committees for various purposes, particularly for forming schools; and having selected some person to their mind, in religious opinions, they exert their influence to establish her school. This cannot be done without comparison

with others; and this comparison must, of course, be to the advantage of the favourite. They soon discover, that a rival mistress is not so evangelical as their own protégé. They first whisper this about, and, in due time, openly denounce the competitor for public favour, as heretical, perhaps anti-christian; throw out shrewd hints concerning the inferiority of her accomplishments; and, at last, venture to whisper away her character in other respects! The children soon feel the effects of this intriguing system. There must be public examinations before splendid assemblages of company. These engender keen competition, bitter heart burnings, jealousies, and envyings; a bad beginning of a female education. In some large towns, the names of the successful candidates for premiums, have been blazoned forth in the newspapers. Thus a spirit of ambition, display, and ostentation, is infused into the character; and the young ladies become anxious not to sink into obscurity. They soon become members of Bible Associations, &c.—and certainly they cannot be better employed. But then they must be Patronesses and Vice-Patronesses, Lady Presidents and Lady Vice-Presidents, Treasurers, Secretaries, and Members of Committee, till half the Association are put in commission. They are, of course, panegyrised and eulogised at Bible Meetings; and their names and offices are blazed about in reports and public prints. It is evident, that all this begets a love of publicity, and renders private domestic duties irksome and insipid, occasions neglect of their children, and makes home uncomfortable to their husbands and families. If, as is generally the case, they have imbibed an infusion of sectarian zeal, and have formed no more congenial attachment, they become the dupes and instruments of designing men, "who creep into houses, lead captive silly women, and for a pretence make long prayers." They are then employed as Missionaries, and sent through the town or neighbourhood, to sow dissension and spiritual antipathies in families; not "to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the hearts of the children to their parents," but "to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law, so that a man's foes are they of his own household." "Withal, they learn to be idle, wandering about from house to house; and not only idle,

but tattlers also, and busy bodies, speaking things which they ought not."

All this must, I think, be acknowledged and lamented by the truly wise and good. At the same time, I freely confess and gladly, that very many escape these snares, while they excel in all the graces of the female character, and yield to none in charitable deeds and faith. They seclude themselves from public notice and religious contention, and peaceably and humbly devote a large portion of their time and means to the relief and instruction of the poor in private, and take their part, without ambition or ostentation, in assisting at schools for poor children; and as to controverted doctrine, they follow the Scripture rule, "Hast thou faith? Have it to thyself, in the sight of God," and not of men.

T. Forgive me, my dear Sir, if I suspect that you are yourself infected with bigotry, and tinctured with the gall of bitterness. Notwithstanding all your professions of liberality and brotherly kindness, you seem to make no allowance for difference of education, for sincere conviction, or for a sense of duty, even in the female sex.

A. No, Sir: you wrong me. I am more likely to be censured for the opposite extreme. As to the female sex, I assure you, that I never read of sisters of charity and mercy in popish countries, without the highest admiration. I can even sympathize with a devout lady, praying in silence to her little Madonna, as the sole patroness of her sex, alone privy to their secret feelings, failings, and trials; the model and exemplar of every female duty; her pattern of purity, maternal tenderness, and divine love; the only female intercessor at the throne of grace. Many of our busy disputatious devotees might envy her feelings, when looking tenderly on the picture, she softly breathes forth in the innocence and simplicity of her heart, "Regardez sa physiognomie. Ah! mon Dieu, qu'elle est belle! qu'elle est gracieuse!" I respect the churchman who adheres to the faith of his fathers, and studies to derive from the institutions of his Church, whatever instruction and consolation for himself and his children, they are capable of affording, without entangling himself in the controversies of the day, or assuming an arrogant ascendancy over his neighbours. But I despise the time-serving hypocrisy of the vain or worldly-minded Conformist. Nay, notwithstanding my detestation of the distinguishing doc-

trines of Calvinism, I would not rashly disturb the faith of a pious Calvinist, who guards his heart against their practical influence. I feel every degree of indulgence for error, when it is accompanied with sincerity, piety, and brotherly kindness; but I must ever protest against that horrid perversion of Christianity, which is so assiduously propagated in our times.

T. Well, my dear Sir, we are nearly agreed on these points. Let us part, before we venture any further. God be with you.

The Unitarian.—No. 4.

The first text which I shall examine, in favour of the Deity of Christ, is from the Old Testament: Isaiah ix. 6 and 7, "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given, and the government shall be upon his shoulder; and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace. And of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice, from henceforth even for ever. The zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this." Before Trinitarians can make this passage prove, that Jesus is the very and eternal God, they have to show, first, that the text is rightly translated here, and that the prophecy refers to Christ at all, which many learned men have doubted, as it is not cited any where in the New Testament; they have to show, secondly, how Christ can be called "the everlasting Father," which, according to Trinitarians, is the title of the first person of the Trinity; how the eternal and unchangeable God could be a child born, or a Son given; how it could be said of the omnipotent Creator of the Universe, the government *shall* be upon his shoulder; or how the government of the Universe could, for a moment, *cease* to be upon *His* shoulder; or how God could be *exalted* to the throne of David; or why it should be said, the zeal of Jehovah of Hosts shall perform this, and not that He shall perform it for himself. If they cannot show these things, they must allow either that the prophecy does not refer to Christ, or that he is here called "the mighty God," &c. in an inferior sense, as Moses is called

a God to Pharaoh, and the magistrates are called gods; and as this very term (in the original El Gibberim) is applied, in Ezek. xxxii. 21; or that the words should be translated as in the Septuagint, "His name shall be called the Messenger of the great design, the Father of the future age, the Prince of Peace;" or, as the present Hebrew text may be otherwise rendered, "His name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor of the mighty God, Father of the future age, Prince of Peace," (see other translations, vol. i. p. 401); or they must allow, that they are merely names translated, as "Elijah" means "Jehovah my God," "Eliezar" "God my strength," or as Jerusalem was called "Jehovah our Righteousness," and many others (for which see the marginal references of the Bible, or for a collection of them, see Christian Reformer, vol. 2, p. 540); either of which allowed, would destroy the proof of the Deity of Christ, which they attempt to found upon this text.

Because the same things are, in some few instances, said of Jehovah in the Old Testament, and of Jesus in the New; and because the same names, such as "Saviour," "Shepherd," &c. are sometimes applied to Jehovah and to Jesus, an argument has been drawn from thence, that Jesus is one in essence with Jehovah. But we must recollect, that Jesus declares himself to have been the agent of Jehovah, in the performance of those works (see my former paper, particularly p. 15): that "the Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world," (1 John iv. 14), and that Moses is spoken of in the same way, Gen. xxi. 1, Num. xxii. 1 and 5, Psalm cvi. 32, 33; and that the names that are applied to Jehovah in the highest sense, are in an inferior sense applied to Moses and to others, as well as to Jesus. See Nehem. ix. 27; 2 Kings xiii. 5; Isaiah xix. 19, 20, xliii. 11; Ezek. xxxiv. 23, 24. An examination at length of all these passages, may be found in Rammohun Roy's Second Appeal in defence of his "Precepts of Jesus," Appendix No. 2; where the futility of the argument which I am opposing, is made very apparent.

The next passage which I shall examine, is the very strong hold of Trinitarianism, John i. 1–14: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God," &c. This is confessedly a very difficult passage—difficult for the Trinitarian; for if (as he contends) the Evangelist meant by the "Word," Jesus

Christ, and meant to affirm that *he* was the supreme God, then there must be two supreme Gods, for the "Word" could not be the same being as that God whom it is said that he "was *with*;" and Trinitarians themselves, at least in words, maintain that there is but *one* true God. It is a difficult passage also to Unitarians, and two or three rather opposite explanations have been given of it, by different learned men of our body. The one party, with whom are the Polish Socinians, Hopton Haynes, the friend of Sir Isaac Newton; the late excellent Mr. Cappe, Mr. Belsham, Mr. Simpson, Dr. Carpenter, and the Editors of the Improved Version, have maintained, that he who is here called "the Word," is the man Jesus Christ, by whom God hath spoken to the world, and that he is here called "the Word" in the same sense as he calls himself "the way, the truth, and the life," &c. They support it by a reference to the commencement of the epistle of John, and they show, that by altering the translation, for which they give very strong reasons, the passage is directly in favour of, or, at least, does not militate against, the inferiority of Christ to the Father; the reader will find the arguments at length for this interpretation (for which there is certainly much to be said) in Belsham, p. 27–39, and in Carpenter, p. 59–67, and 147–150. Another party, with whom are the celebrated Grotius, Lardner, Priestley, Lindsey, and many modern Unitarians have thought, that by "the Word," is meant the personified word of God, "who spake, and it was done; who commanded, and it stood fast;" whilst Mr. Wright, in his Essays, p. 439, &c. has advocated an opinion between these two. I am myself inclined to the second interpretation, and shall, therefore, proceed, upon that view, to explain what I conceive to be the meaning of every verse.

"In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." That is, in the beginning of all things, was the word or power of God. The Jews personified almost all the attributes of God; wisdom is beautifully personified in the 8th and 9th chapters of the Proverbs, the phraseology of which, John seems, in some measure, to have copied here. John tells us, in his epistle, that "God is love," "God is light;" and the Jews called that power of God by which he made the world, and does his other extraordinary works, his "Word," (See Psalm xxxiii. 6, Heb. xi. 2, 2 Peter iii. 5), as when God

said "let there be light," "let there be a firmament." This word, or power, was "with God," was an essential attribute of his nature, and an emanation from him, (see 1 John i. 2), where "eternal life" is said to be "*with* the Father;" and "was God," was not any thing distinct from him. "The same was in the beginning with God," before it had gone forth to cause the world to be created. "All things were made by him." "By the *word* of the Lord were the heavens made; and all the hosts of them by the breath of his mouth, (Psalm xxxiii. 6). "By the word of God the heavens were of old and the earth," "and by the same word are kept in store," (2 Peter iii. 5 and 7; see also Psalm cvii. 20, xlvii. 18). "And without him was not any thing made that was made." There is no difficulty in this: every part of creation was performed by the "word"—the mandate of Jehovah, he spake all into being. "In him" the word, or power of God, as revealed by the prophets, "was life, and the life was the light of men;" the expression of God's pleasure by the prophets, was the only light given to the world before the coming of Christ. "And the light shineth in darkness," in the darkness of heathen superstition, and under the veil of the Jewish economy, "but the darkness comprehended it not," *i. e.* it was not comprehended until the true light came. All this I conceive to be an allusion to the state of the world before the coming of John the Baptist, the forerunner of Christ; the Evangelist then goes on to mention the coming of John, and the revelation of the true light by *him* to whom it was communicated for that purpose, even Jesus Christ. "There was a man sent from God, whose name was John. The same came for a witness, to bear witness of the Light, that all men through him might believe. He was not that Light, but was sent to bear witness of that Light." He himself was not appointed to proclaim that Light, but was sent to bear witness to, or to point out, the person who *was* commissioned to show it forth. "That was the true Light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world." This Light shall be of universal operation; it is not now shown to the Jews only, but to all the world—to every man. "He was in the world," here the Evangelist returns to speak of the personified word or power of God; "and the world was made by him," see above, "and the world knew him not;" *i. e.* the generality of men knew

not that the word of God was come into the world. "He came unto his own" people, the Jews, "and his own received him not"—would not acknowledge him, would not understand who he was. "But as many as received him, to them he gave power" or authority, or privilege, "to become the sons of God, who are born," &c. The Evangelist then proceeds to show how the true light was communicated, and how the Word or power of God came unto his own: "And the Word was made" or became "flesh;" (flesh is here put for man generally). These blessings were produced not by the miraculous appearance of Jehovah himself, but by the Word or power before spoken of, becoming tabernacled in the person of Jesus Christ. "And dwelt amongst us, full of grace and truth," "and we beheld his glory"—the glory of the man in whom the word did abide, "the glory as of the only begotten of the Father." Christ is in this Gospel called "only begotten," where he is, by the other Evangelists, styled "best beloved," peculiarly so, since in him the word, the power, the spirit of God was displayed "without measure." In short, this passage seems to me, to mean, that the Word or power of God, that is, God himself, created all things, spoke by the Prophets, was life and light, under the Jewish economy; was not always comprehended or duly attended to by the children of men; was at length in the wisdom of the Deity "made flesh," or manifested in the person of Jesus Christ, who appeared in the world vested with the divine authority, as the "only begotten of the Father." The writer to the Hebrews, in like manner, begins his epistle by showing the great superiority of Christ to all the other prophets and messengers of God. Thus we find, that this passage, though a difficult one, may be proved to be completely Unitarian.

(To be Continued.)

THE CHRISTIAN PIONEER.

GLASGOW, *April* 1, 1829.

IN our last Number we gave a brief account of the proceedings in this City, in relation to a Petition in behalf of universal religious liberty. On the following Sunday, the Petition lay for signature in the Catholic and Unitarian Chapels, and early in the week

was sent for presentation to Lord Holland and Mr. Brougham, having upwards of four thousand two hundred names attached to it, all of whom were above sixteen years of age. The intolerant and outrageous conduct we before noticed, if not higher and better motives, at length roused another part of the inhabitants of this City, by whom a Petition in favour of the measures of Ministers in relation to the Catholic question, was prepared; but being left for signature at two Institutions, to which only their Subscribers had access, did not receive more than 300 names, but those consisted of men of weight and influence in the community. We rejoiced that these individuals resolved on petitioning, and have no doubt that petitioning in another form, had greater effect than if, under the circumstances, they had joined the prayer of the people; but we also think, that it was their duty to have first vindicated the sacred right of the expression of opinion, which, in our case, was grossly and shamefully violated, and afterwards to have adopted their own mode of stating their views and feelings. Popular rights ought never to be assailed with impunity; and we hold in this case, as in all others, that where the power of preventing, resisting, or remedying evil is possessed, "he who allows oppression, shares the crime."

Whilst we still rejoice in the measures now in progress through Parliament, so far as they are founded in justice and benevolence, we cannot withhold the expression of our repugnance to certain of the provisions. We are not amongst the number of those who pay any great respect to titles, but were we Catholics, we should protest indignantly against any interference with the names which we chose to give our Pastors, or with which, according to the government of our Church, they were invested; and as friends of perfect religious liberty, we contend that it is an unwarrantable interference. To be called Bishop of this, or Bishop of that, is of little comparative moment; it is the right of any earthly power to dictate in such matters, with which we battle. The use of a gown, as part of the dress of a minister, we conceive to be a thing of perfect indifference; but if a Government strove to force its wearing as a means of possessing civil or religious privileges, then would it be a tyranny that should be resisted. A *declaration* of certain opinions may contain nothing to which we could object, but if that declaration be presented as a test, the submitting to it would be an acknowledgement of the right of the civil power to legislate in religion. And as to the Catholic Bishops *assuming* the title of the Episcopalian Prelates, we much question if the assumption be not originally the other way. The taking away their living was the former piece of injustice, and now even the consolation of the barren title is to be denied. On the same principle, we object to the clauses, occupying as they do a large portion of one of the Bills, relative to the Jesuits. If these, or any other men, commit aught against the peace and good order of society, let them be punished; but if merely because persons calling themselves by the same name, have, in bygone ages, perpetrated outrage, people now living are to be treated as aliens and outcasts, then do we think it to be a violation of freedom, and a denial of

justice. If thus "bad begins, still worse remains behind." The disfranchisement of the forty shilling freeholders, has our decided reprobation. It is the deprivation of a positive and actual privilege. With the exception of the removal of the brand on the Catholics, which we rejoice in as the establishment of a great and generous principle, an equality of civil rights without regard to religious faith, this disfranchising clause we cannot but regard as legislating against the poor and in favour of the wealthy. We hold, at all times, that making wealth the criterion of civil privilege, is unworthy of Christian law-makers; that to man, as man, if not incapacitated by crime or mental defect, ought the rights and privileges of civil society to pertain. Had the question, therefore, been, which should have the right of voting, the forty shilling or the £10 freeholder, we should have said, "in respect to their *property*, NEITHER." But when, as now, the point at issue is, you shall have the stigma removed from your faith, but you must, as its price, renounce a privilege which is the only thing about you that has given you the slightest importance in the state, it does seem to us, whatever expediency may assert, to be a measure based on injustice, and to involve a principle, which, if carried out to all its legitimate consequences, is fraught with danger to the rights and liberties of man. We see well enough the glaring absurdity and contradiction of the lease-hold possessor of a quarter of an English rood having a privilege, by virtue of that possession, which is denied to the owner of hundreds of acres; or of a man serving seven years to gain that, which may be had by another who hires a room for six months; and had the matter related merely to a fair and equitable adjustment of these contending interests, we should not have touched upon it in our publication. But when one privilege is to be taken away from its present possessors, and taken away, too, because imperious necessity has forced the removal of laws attaching stigmas and penalties to a particular faith, and countenancing false and injurious imputations on that faith, then we do feel it to be our duty to protest against the injustice, and to characterize it as an act unbefitting the dignity of legislators, and a paltry compromise with irrational and unmanly fears.

Having thus expressed our individual opinions, we gladly turn to a more pleasant theme, and, with sincere and grateful feelings, express our admiration of the enlightened and truly Christian sentiments uttered by Dr. Chalmers, with all that eloquence for which he is so distinguished, at the meeting in Edinburgh. We had occasion, in our Second Volume, p. 176, to introduce to the notice of our readers, the opinions of the Doctor on the subject of Catholic disabilities. This more public declaration of them, especially at the present crisis, calls for our unfeigned respect and eulogy. We hail it as an auspicious omen for truth and liberty, that such sentiments should be held, and publicly enforced and advocated, by an individual holding the situation of Dr. Chalmers. We have only one thing to regret as connected with his declaration of them, the inconsistency, which to our minds is manifest, in the Doctor's continuing in communion with any Church,

established and supported by the civil power. In comparison with the Churches of Rome and of England, we hold the Church of Scotland to be purity itself; but if, as the Doctor affirms, and we believe, the truth of God—the declarations of the Bible, need no other weapons for their support and dissemination and universal triumph, than Scripture, reason, and prayer, we at least must protest against the inconsistency of adherence to any Church which joins itself in "unholy alliance" to the carnal and worldly instruments, wielded even by that Church of which the Doctor is so distinguished an ornament.

Those who oppose the measure in agitation, said Dr. Chalmers, have "been designed by the appellation of Anti-Catholic, leaving to us the goodly designation of Pro-Catholic. There never was a grosser imposition practised upon the public mind than by the meaning of those two words. We are not Pro-Catholics. We are not indifferent, neither are we hostile, to the holy cause of Protestantism. I cannot answer for others; but in vindication of myself, I declare that it is in the spirit of the utmost devotedness to that cause that I now come here, and because in this emancipation of Papists, I see for Protestants—I see for Protestantism, a still greater and more glorious emancipation. The truth is, that these disabilities have hung as a dead weight around the Protestant cause for more than a century. They have enlisted in opposition, some of the most unconquerable principles of our nature—resentment on account of injury, and the pride of adhering to a suffering cause. They have transformed the whole nature of the contest, by having rooted and given ten-fold obstinacy to error; they have given to the side of Protestantism the hateful aspect of tyranny, while, on the side of the Catholics, we behold a generous and high-minded resistance to what they deem to be oppression; they have transformed a nation of heretics into a nation of heroes. We could have refuted and shamed the heretic out of heresy, but we cannot pull down the hero from his altitude. From the first introduction of this heterogeneous element into the question, the cause of truth has gone backward; it has ever since been met by unyielding defiance, from a people irritated, but not crushed, under a sense of indignity. This notable expedient for bringing down Popery, has compressed it into a firmness, and enclosed it within a phalanx, which, unless opened by emancipation, will be found impenetrable. Gentlemen might draw arguments from history against us; but there is one passage in history they never can dispose of. How comes it to pass, that Protestantism achieved such a triumph, and made such progress, when it had pains and penalties to fight against: and how comes it, that its progress was arrested from the moment it laid on those pains and penalties in turn? What have all the enactments of the statute-book done for the cause of Protestantism in Ireland? And how comes it to pass, that when single-handed truth walked through the land with the might and prowess of a conqueror, no sooner was she propped up by the authority of the state, no sooner was the armour of intolerance given to her, than her brilliant career of victory was for ever ended. When she took up the carnal and

laid down the spiritual weapon, her strength went out of her—she was struck with impotency. In giving up the warfare of principle for the warfare of politics, she lost her power. With pains and penalties against it, the cause of the Reformation had done every thing in Britain. With pains and penalties in its favour, it had confessedly done nothing or worse than nothing in Ireland. The question does not require the evidence of history for its elucidation. There shines upon it an immediate light from the known laws and principles of human nature. When truth and falsehood enter into collision upon equal terms, and with their own appropriate weapons, the result is infallible, "Magna est veritas et prevalebit." But when to strengthen the cause of truth we put the force of the statute-book under her command, there instantly starts up on the side of falsehood, an auxiliary far more formidable. I know that those disabilities are meant to serve as a barrier of defence for Protestantism against the encroachments of Popery, but they have only proved a barrier of defence for Popery, against the encroachments of Protestantism. They had drawn a line of circumvallation around the strongholds of Protestant faith, and they have been in effect a line of circumvallation around the strongholds of the Catholic faith. It is to force this now difficult and almost inaccessible stronghold, that I want the wall of separation taken down. I trust to the combined force of truth and charity, and it is because I believe it to be omnipotent, that I am an emancipationist. I agree with the Duke of Wellington in thinking, that when once those political distinctions are removed, the result will be the spread of Protestantism in Ireland. Had we mingled more extensively with our Catholic fellow-subjects, and kept them company in all the walks of civil and political business, we would this day have had the transfusion of another feeling, and the breath of another spirit amongst us; nor would he have beheld, as now in Ireland, the resolute and unyielding attitude of an aggrieved and outcast population. I have one word more to say, upon a topic of great interest. I am aware of one advantage which our opponents have against us, and that is, a certain command over the religious feelings of the population. Yet I am not aware of any public topic on which the popular and prevailing cry ever ran more counter to the whole drift and spirit of Christianity. What other instruments do we read of in the New Testament for defending Protestantism, but the Word of God and the Spirit of God? How do the Apostles explain those principles, when they speak of the triumphs of that truth which is mighty to the pulling down of strongholds? They tell us, that it is because the weapons of their warfare were not carnal, but spiritual. I consider the exercise of those spiritual weapons the only ones which are of force to assail the strongholds either of Popery or Paganism. The Kingdom of God refuses to be indebted for its advancement to any other. Reason, Scripture, prayer, ought to comprise the whole armoury of religion, and by these alone the battles of our faith are to be successfully fought. Ever since Intolerance, that unseemly associate, has been admitted within our camp, the cause of the Reformation has come down

from its vantage ground. She has wrested this engine from the hands of her opponents, and wielded it herself; and from that moment her cause has been at a dead stand. I want her to be disencumbered of this weight, and restored to her own proper and peculiar energies. I want truth and force to be dissevered from each other, the moral and spiritual not to be implicated with the grossly physical means. Never will our cause prosper, never will it prevail in Ireland, until it is delivered from the outrage and contamination of so unholy an alliance. It is not because I hold Popery to be innocent, that I want the removal of these disabilities; but because I hold, that if these were taken out of the way, she would be tenfold more assailable. It is not because I am indifferent to the good of Protestantism, that I want to displace these artificial crutches from under her, but because I want, that, freed from every symptom of decrepitude and decay, she should stand forth in her own native strength, and make manifest to all men how firm a support she has in the goodness of her cause, and on the basis of her orderly and well laid arguments. It is because I count so much—and will any Protestant here present, say that I count too much?—on her Bible, and her evidences, and the blessing of God upon her churches, and the force of her resistless appeals to the conscience and the understandings of men; it is because of her strength and sufficiency in these, that I would disclaim the aids of the statute-book, and own no dependance or obligation whatever on a system of intolerance. These were enough for her in the days of her sufferings, and should be more than enough for her in the days of her comparative safety. It is not by our fears and our false alarms, that we do honour to Protestantism. A far more befitting honour to the great cause is, the homage of our confidence; for what Sheridan said of the liberty of the press, admits of most emphatic application to this religion of truth and liberty. "Give," says that distinguished orator, "give to Ministers a corrupt House of Commons; give them a pliant and a servile House of Lords; give them the keys of the Treasury, and the patronage of the Crown; and give me the liberty of the press, and with this mighty engine I will overthrow the fabric of corruption, and establish upon its ruins the rights and privileges of the people." In like manner, give the Catholics of Ireland their emancipation; give them seats in the Parliament of their country; give them a free and equal participation in the politics of the realm; give them a place at the ear of Majesty, and a voice in his councils; and give me the circulation of the Bible, and with this mighty engine, I will overthrow the tyranny of Antichrist, and establish the fair and original form of Christianity on its ruins."

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

Communications have been received from Homo—Barnabas on the Co-operative System—G. B.—F. K.—B. of Bristol.

THE

CHRISTIAN PIONEER.

No. 33. MAY, 1829. Vol. III.

On the Obstacles to the Spread of Unitarianism.

SIR, To the Editor.

Mr. Kenrick, in his excellent sermon preached at the anniversary of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association in 1827, ably developed the impediments to the progress of Unitarianism, which are found in external circumstances. Another, perhaps a more difficult, certainly a more delicate inquiry remains, which directs the attention to the state of things within; and asks, if there are no serious obstacles to the progress of truth, existing amongst ourselves? To make such an inquiry, is dictated by a sense of duty, and by a regard to consistency also; for it is not a mark of wisdom, to labour for the removal of external disadvantages, and remain ignorant or careless of those which, regarding ourselves, admit, if we are true to our principles, of a more prompt remedy than such as are at least chiefly beyond our immediate influence. In the remarks which I propose to make, my chief object is, to invite the attention of Unitarians to a subject, which I cannot but regard as of vital importance.

A great, not to say the greatest, obstacle to the progress of Unitarian Christianity, consists, I imagine, in the present condition of our ministers. With scarcely an exception, certainly with very few exceptions, the stipends which they receive from their congregations, are utterly insufficient for the maintenance of themselves and families. The necessary consequence is, that other pursuits are engaged in, to eke out something like a competency. But no man can adequately discharge the duties of two professions; and either the ministry must suffer, or the school (or whatever engagement an individual may enter upon) must be neglected. As, however, the school is mostly found to furnish the chief means of subsistence, that, of necessity, receives the chief attention. Nor can it, nor ought it to be otherwise. The first duty of every man, and consequently of every minister, is to supply his family with the means of a comfortable subsistence, and to lay

by, if possible, a small resource for a time of need. The school, therefore, occupies the best energies of the minister; and it is only in the intervals—intervals which ought to be chiefly devoted to the refreshment of his mind and the strengthening of his body—that he finds an opportunity either to improve his own knowledge and his own faculties, or to prepare for others the materials of intellectual and moral amendment. But notwithstanding the scantiness of their emoluments, the ministers of British Unitarians contribute largely to the great object of spreading the views which are peculiar to their system, and the moral advantages which ensue from them. They contribute by their purses often more largely than is generally known. But, above all, they contribute by their exertions: I mean, that in devoting a portion of their time to the ministry for a scanty pittance, they deprive themselves of the reward which their talents, learning, and character, would ensure to them in any worldly pursuit in which they might engage. All that they lose by their devotement to the ministry—by the exhaustion of spirits, the diminution of energy, the occupation of time, the disesteem attaching to the public advocates of an obnoxious system—all the loss that ensues from each and all of these, may fairly and properly be termed a contribution to the common cause. Nor is this the only way in which they are called on to contribute. Without the agency of the press, whether in books or in periodical works, our cause would not have made the progress which it has done. But who has not heard how rare a thing it is for a work of a Unitarian, to pay even the expenses incurred in paper and printing? And our periodicals are, it is well known, almost entirely supported by gratuitous exertions. Their chief supporters are ministers; and here again is a contribution made by them to the common cause. These contributions are, I contend, *bona fide* donations. They consist not, it is true, in money, but they consist in money's worth. They consist in what money cannot always purchase, and without which money would avail but little. They are, I have said, money's worth: for time and talent are a minister's capital, as valuable to him and to his family, as the cotton of the Lancashire or the wool of the Yorkshire merchant. Let some of our Unitarian brethren in these counties have, as is the case with their ministers, to expend the half of their time and their energies in the promotion of Unita-

rian Christianity, and the balance-sheet at the end of the year, will prove that they have made a real and an important contribution to the furtherance of religion. Now it is, we continue, unjust that ministers should be thus taxed and disproportionately burdened. There is, it is allowed on all hands, no peculiar privileges attaching to the ministry; why, then, should there be peculiar burdens? Or, at least, ought there not to be an equitable adjustment, and something like an equalization of burden? Less than this, however, would amply satisfy our ministers, and bring all their energies to bear on the great and common object. Relieve them from their present engagements with the school—enable them to furnish their families with the means of a decent subsistence, and thus to devote their energies, entire and unimpaired, to the great duties of their ministerial office, and all that they wish for, will be attained, and great then will be the increase of true religion. To assist in this, is the duty of every professor of Unitarian Christianity. And how small a sacrifice would it cost! Many opulent men in our congregations, think it much if they contribute £10 per annum to the maintenance of public worship; whilst their minister, with means that ought not to be mentioned in comparison with those of his richer hearers, contributes ten or twenty times that sum, for the same object. How easy would it be for his hearers to relieve him from so unjust a tax. If the richer would but double their subscription, and each of the poor give some small matter to the common fund—would all that could afford (and there are not many, comparatively, who could not) take in the several periodicals that issue from our body, and thus, by an increased sale, enable the editors to remunerate their assistants, the means of ministers would in general be far more adequate to their wants. Then also our cause would flourish. Ministers would have time to devise, and time and energy to execute plans for the common weal. A greater intercourse would take place between them as individuals, and as the representatives of congregations. Our public meetings would increase in interest and efficiency, and not only the regular services of the Lord's day would improve in character, but ministers would be able to discharge their pastoral duties, (which at present are almost wholly neglected,) and to devote a portion of their time in the week to the instruction

of the young of their flock, and to the ministry of the Word in their neighbourhoods.

We are not, I fear, all of us agreed as to the degree of exertion which we are called upon to make, and this circumstance I regard as a great impediment to the progress of Unitarianism. Yet one would imagine, that it is right to be zealously affected in a good cause; and the cause of truth and of religion, involving as it does the best interests of humanity, is assuredly of a nature to claim the devotement of every good and benevolent man. In believing, then, that our opinions are the truth as it is in Jesus, we find an obligation to the strenuous, yet charitable maintenance of them. Surely, if the subject be calmly considered, there can scarcely be room for diversity of opinion: Christian benevolence requires us freely to give what we have freely received. It should always be borne in mind, that Unitarianism is not a system of barren opinions; it involves the vital principles of the Gospel; and exhibiting as it does the unity of God, and thereby the supremacy of the Father, represents the destiny of man as under the direction of infinite and paternal benignity; while, in holding forth the doctrine of a future life, and a righteous retribution, revealed by one whose excellences are so endearing and elevated, it contains the elements of the purest virtue and the most generous piety. There is, at least, the semblance of a reason, for the opponent to question the sincerity of those, who, professing to hold principles so efficient, restrain their divine efficacy, and place, by their inactivity, an effectual bar to their dissemination; and, undesignedly indeed, but still in reality, such persons cast a blame on the memory of those pious revivers of the Unitarian faith, to whose judicious zeal they owe their liberation from grievous errors, and their possession of invaluable truths. For either Priestley and Lindsey were wrong in their benevolent exertions, or those who having received through them the principles they profess to revere, imitate not their devotedness to the cause of the Gospel, are worthy of blame.

While, however, we are not all agreed, we cannot all concur. Not only so: our want of agreement gives rise to misunderstandings, and causes us to spend our energies upon unworthy objects. A diversity of opinion there may be in reality, but this diversity is magnified, in our estimation, by being the subject of writing and conversation.

The word party is heard amongst us; zeal and inactivity become rallying words, and the evils of party spirit ensue: the zealous are regarded as intemperate—the inactive as indifferent; and disrespect and suspicion supervene, to diminish energies, in themselves greatly inferior to the work that remains to be effected. A correct understanding, therefore, in regard to the degree of exertion required of us, is most desirable; and I cannot but believe, that such an understanding would soon be arrived at, if the matter were fairly and calmly contemplated. Let there but prevail a charitable and brotherly feeling: let us alike forget, if it has happened that the zealous have been forward or indiscreet, or if the exertions of others have not in our estimation been proportionate to the importance of the objects at issue; and there will, I trust, speedily ensue a concentration of effort—a unity of heart and operation, from which no inconsiderable success may be anticipated.

This leads me to ask, if our plans are entirely such as they ought to be? Is there a sufficient degree of union amongst us? Does there prevail a positive wish and desire to increase the degree of union that does exist? Do we, individually, make an effort for so desirable an object? Do no personal or local feelings diminish the usefulness of institutions already in existence? Do we, individually, feel an ardour in the grand object, forgetful whether or not the plans adopted meet with our entire approbation? Do those of us who are not engaged in the ministry, labour, as they have opportunity, to strengthen the hands of their pastors—to diffuse our tenets by the loan of books and tracts—by conversation—and, more than all, by using the measure of their abilities in preaching and teaching the unsearchable riches of Christ? Were even *a few* of the "laymen" of our congregations thus to lay themselves out for the furtherance of the Gospel, how much more gratifying would be its progress; but still more gratifying would each and every one consider himself as a minister and servant of Christ, bound not only by the silent operation of a pious life, but also by active and sustained efforts, to promote the interests of pure and undefiled religion.

There is only one more question with which I will trouble your readers at present: Does a spirit of devotion prevail amongst us, to the degree in which our principles and the example of Christ demand? I do not ask, if we

are imperfect as men and as Christians; but is there not a deficiency of piety amongst us, for which no apology can be offered? I put the question, not to blame—not in a spirit of uncharitableness—but in grief. If we are obviously deficient in devotion, this, more than all other impediments, will retard the success of the Gospel in our hands. This deficiency, if it exist, will affect all our operations; while under its influence, we expect the blessing of God upon our efforts in vain. Let each put the question to himself, and as he tenders his own interests and the interests of truth, let the reply be unbiassed, and the conduct influenced by the decision. G. C. S.

Church Establishments.

Those ancient and venerable institutions called church establishments, the unblushing advocates of mental slavery, are unquestionably "great marvels," and are surely deserving of grateful support, because they abrogate the labour of thinking, and dispense with the fatiguing task of inquiry and private judgment, with the perplexities often attendant thereon! Skilled in the depths of moral chemistry, they with ease sublime the spirit of polemic theology into a few sententious phrases, and embody for their votaries every thing essential in one or two (plain) creeds with appendages, which kindly supersede the necessity for individual research, because containing all which it is necessary to know or which can be known! He who enters within the sacred precincts of an establishment, bows his neck to the yoke at the portals, and having pronounced the required shibboleth, sacrificed to the idol uniformity, and registered his consent and belief to the prescribed propositions, be they perspicuous or mysterious, consistent or discrepant;—having renounced liberty of thought, surrendered his judgment, and enslaved his convictions, he prostrates himself before the authority which stamps him slave, and which being to him more potent than conscience, as the arbiter of right, exonerates him from the consequences of belief. For ever chained to first impressions, he renounces his powers of progressive improvement, and becomes stationary and motionless; wrapping his talents in a napkin, instead of bending all his capabilities to the ennobling object of progressive approximation to that

high moral station which seems to be the intention and design of man's creation. Establishments have, in fact, reversed the legitimate operation of the intellectual powers; nay, with awful presumption, have done the same with the teachings of inspiration. "The very religion which came from God's goodness to enlarge the human soul with a kindred goodness, has been employed to narrow it to a sect, to rear the Inquisition, and to kindle fires for the martyr. The very religion, given to make the understanding and conscience free, has, by a criminal perversion, served to break them into subjection to priests, ministers, and human creeds. Ambition and craft have seized on the solemn doctrines of an omnipotent God, and of future punishment, and turned them into engines against the child, the trembling female, the ignorant adult, until the sceptic has been emboldened to charge on religion the chief miseries and degradation of human nature." But "Christianity has no tendency to break the human spirit, or to make man a slave." It contains nothing narrowing or depressing, nothing of the littleness of systems, which human fear and craft and ambition have engendered, no minute legislation, no descending to precise details, no arbitrary injunctions, no yoke of ceremonies, no outward religion. Every thing breathes freedom, liberality, enlargement.* It is establishments which peremptorily decree of the mind, hitherto shalt thou come but no farther—which draw a line beyond which no energy must presume to pass —which describe a circle whose magic boundaries must for ever confine the knowledge and information of man. But their might and power has passed the meridian. Knowledge in its onward flood, has long swept beyond the sites which support their ponderous foundations; and as each succeeding wave with gentle and almost unperceived undulation, is silently advancing—as the tide of improvement is gradually swelling and expanding, and covering one prejudice and error and superstition after another, although they still tower in melancholy loneliness above the expanse of waters, they are but as so many beacons, denoting exactly by their localities how much has been realized, and indicating the extent of the progress of the moral and intellectual powers. Time was,

---

* Channing's "Great Design of Christianity."

when their haughty claims were universally respected, and the prostration of the understanding implicitly yielded at their bidding. But men are learning to think and reason; the mind will burst its trammels, and rejoicing in its native freedom, and giving free liberty to its insatiate cravings for other things than those of time and sense—to its undefinable yearnings, its spiritual soarings, and divine and celestial aspirations, it will be no longer restrained from pursuing its heavenly flight, nor submit to wear the fetters imposed by dogmatic fallibility.

It is deserving of remark, that although all establishments owe their origin to the labours of private judgment, inasmuch as they breathe the spirit of their individual architects, and by the fashion of their several formations indicate the hands which formed them, (Protestant institutions indeed, in their infancy, avowing the principle, and exercising it as an unquestionable right) yet all are singularly inconsistent, in censuring its general adoption. Their existence depends upon its destruction; conscious that it is the universal heritage of all mankind, they yet wish it to be considered, as specially entailed upon themselves, and denounce those who attempt to participate in their birth-right, as heretics, schismatics, and unbelievers! Its importance, however, is now seen, its value duly estimated, and it is claimed as an inalienable privilege, which no church possesses power to abrogate. Another and most important right which establishments scruple not to use, but which they decry the use of by others, is that of the public avowal of sentiment. But upon the very same grounds upon which they proclaim their peculiar dogmas, may the private individual entrench himself, and justly claim the equal right of publishing and advocating the result of his inquiries.

Establishments, then, although they are opposed to liberty of thought and speech, and demand from the members of their several communions, a blind and implicit belief, cannot consistently refuse to others a participation in the rights which belong in common to all, upon which they are founded, and of which they were the zealous defenders, when necessary for self-defence. And such is the amazing deference paid to them by many—such the paralyzing influence which they wield, extending through all the ramifications of that society upon whose intellectual energies they press, that it may not perhaps be deemed

irrelevant to have attempted to show, not only the slavery and degradation which they impose upon those who are the subjects of their authority; but also that their foundations are laid on those inalienable and immutable principles whose exercise they subsequently found necessary to prescribe, to consolidate and secure their arrogant pretensions.

We proceed, in continuation, to offer a few thoughts tending to prove, that, sanctioned or condemned by establishments, private judgment is still a right, and the avowal of conviction an imperative duty. Their pristine example, which they cannot deny, proves the first; and as no mortal power can abrogate it, it still retains all its obligatory force. And to proclaim the results of inquiry, is an inseparable adjunct; they must stand or fall together. Is truth elicited by discussion?—then is the statement of opposing principles essentially requisite. Is private judgment a paramount duty?—it is materially aided by being put in possession of varying opinions, and being enabled to examine the statements of differing or adverse sentiments. It is thus that materials are collected, that evidence is furnished, that facts are weighed, reasons and arguments tested, fallacies detected, and error exposed. A profession of belief without the possession of clear and definite ideas, is indeed a common occurrence, but no assumed principles can be of real worth, or be in the least influential, unless founded on conviction. If actions proceed from motives, and motives are the result of mental decision, the consistency which the world expects to find existing between opinions and actions, is perfectly reasonable. The Volume of Inspiration, and the experience of mankind, refer to actions as the criteria of principles. By their fruits ye shall know them. Do men gather grapes from thorns, or figs from thistles? The value of principles can be estimated simply, by a consideration of the actions which they originate: this is the only true test which we possess. An action cannot be praiseworthy, unless it is conscientious; the best intention is useless to the world, until reduced to action.

(To be Continued.)

To the Editor of the Christian Pioneer.

Sir,

My hand happened to be rather full of other work, at the time when I received Mr. Yates's second communication in your January Number; and, having but a light impression of the necessity of answering it, I subsequently either forgot it, or allowed any thing else that required my attention to take the precedence. Some of your readers may probably have been attributing my delay to other causes. But, being conscious to myself of truth, any such surmises give me very little concern; nor will the concern be much greater, if, notwithstanding what I have now to say, they should still be retained.

I have already intimated, that I have no intention of entering into a renewed controversy in your pages, on the general merits of the great questions at issue between us. Some explanation of a personal nature was all that I ever intended; and I am happy that my antagonist has, to a certain extent, expressed himself satisfied with the explanation given. I certainly would have gone further, could I have done it in sincerity. One observation I must still be allowed to make. Mr. Yates says—"Now, although I cannot consider this admission as making full amends for the wrong which he has done me, and am at a loss to perceive the consistency of asserting that I may be a man of real integrity, and yet that I am capable of 'wilful and deliberate misrepresentation,' whenever a tempting occasion offers, or a sufficiently strong inducement allures me to the crime, I am nevertheless willing to accept Dr. Wardlaw's apology, and I hereby express my wish that every thing personal or offensive between us could be expunged from what we have written."—pages 159, 160. I should be under the influence of some very unchristian feeling, were I not disposed to affix my hearty *Amen!* to the wish thus expressed. But what I have to remark is, my surprise that Mr. Yates should be at any loss to perceive my consistency in charging him *in the one instance in question* with "wilful misrepresentation," and at the same time "not meaning to *extend the charge to a general one against his moral reputation as an honest man.*" Is there no difference between alleging that a man has *in one instance* been betrayed into an evil, and affirming him capable of the evil, "*whenever a tempting occasion offers?*" Had I affirmed *this*, and yet admitted his "moral reputation as an

honest man," I should, to be sure, have been inconsistent enough. But I have affirmed no such thing; and I will not suppose my opponent to have so high an opinion of his own steadfastness, as to think it an *impossibility* that he should *even once* be successfully tempted to what is wrong. No man that has even a moderate acquaintance with the deceitfulness of the heart, will venture to say so of himself; nor is the most liberal charity bound to think it of another.

I am not sensible of having used an inappropriate phrase when I represented Mr. Yates as, in the Advertisement to the 2d edition of his Sequel, *giving me the lie.* When one man tells another, "I am certain you do not believe what you say,"—what else should it be called? I am sorry that any "apparently polite and friendly behaviour" of mine, when I met him on the street, should have contributed to mislead his mind into a misconception of the state of mine. Meetings on the street, in the case of a stranger coming to town, are generally sudden and unexpected;—so that there is no time to bethink one's self of grievances or of any thing else: and on such occasions the impulse of the moment and the *customs* of politeness, do, I am aware, too frequently betray one into a behaviour that is hardly consonant with what due reflection might have dictated in the relative circumstances of the parties, and that is apt to be subsequently construed into simulation and hypocrisy. I thank Mr. Yates for the hint, and hope I shall profit by it.

My antagonist continues to vindicate himself from the charge I had brought against him, on the ground of his having first given a statement of the views of Trinitarians in their own words. He says (page 161) "I need only appeal to the common sense of your readers to perceive, that, if I first gave a full and clear statement of the doctrine, to which no objection has ever been made, and which was expressed partly in the very words of my opponent, no implied statement which I might afterwards introduce in the course of my argument, could be a 'wilful and deliberate misrepresentation.' I could not be such a blockhead as to endeavour to 'blind my readers' by contradicting myself." I thought Mr. Yates had learned better logic than this at Glasgow. Is it, then, impossible for a man, after quoting the sentiments of an opponent in the opponent's own language, to introduce subsequently,

when he comes to reply, a statement in other terms, terms of his own, containing a misrepresentation of the known meaning of what he had previously cited? This is precisely the misdemeanour with which I conceived him chargeable. And to allege that a man could not possibly *intend* to misrepresent, merely because he had just before given the statement which he *does* misrepresent, does not appear to me to be very convincing logic. There are too few controversies in which it is not done.

With regard to the subject itself—of the union of the divine and human natures in the person of Christ—every reader must at once perceive, how easy it must always be, on a point of this kind, to start puzzles. Mr. Yates is sufficiently aware how many topics there are, on which a child may ask questions such as neither he nor I, nor greater divines and philosophers than either of us, could answer. He is again doing what he can, to draw me beyond the line of Scripture,—to get me out from behind the entrenchments of the divine record into the open field of metaphysical discussion. Unitarians are generally fond of this; and Trinitarians have too often yielded to their enticements. But the question is one simply of *fact;* and can be determined in no other way than by a direct reference to Scripture testimony. If it be true, that the *names, attributes, works,* and *worship* of the true God are there ascribed to Jesus Christ,—it follows that Jesus Christ is the true God; and the conclusion is quite independent of our ability or inability to conceive of the *manner* in which divinity is in his person united with humanity. The sole questions are—Is this the testimony of the Bible? and—Is the Bible which contains it the Word of God? To go beyond this is to go beyond our only source of information, and to "wander in counsels of our own."

As I do not acknowledge Mr. Yates in the capacity either of Grand Inquisitor, or even of Father Confessor, I take my own way of replying to his questions (questions which in the style of them are not without a spice of impertinence); which is, by very simply re-stating my belief, and then, with a single additional remark or two, leaving the subject to your readers; that, if they be in earnest, they may "search the Scriptures" for themselves, and, if they shall be so inclined, assist their researches by the controversy, long since closed, between my antagonist and myself.

By the human nature of Christ, then, I mean, (and Mr. Yates knows I mean) in the language of the Westminster Divines, "a true body and a reasonable soul." When "the Word" which "was in the beginning with God," and which "was God," "was made flesh," he united his divine nature with the human, in a way admitted to be by us incomprehensible, so as to become God manifest in the flesh,—"one person in two distinct natures." We do not pretend to explain the *mode* of this union, and consider the *fact* alone as revealed, and as consequently the sole object of faith; and although in the fact we are sensible of *mystery*, we are not sensible of *contradiction:*—1. Because the two natures are unblended in their properties, —the attributes of each remaining peculiar to itself:—2. Because the human soul is sinless, in perfectly holy harmony with the nature of the indwelling Deity; so that there is no contrariety of moral principle, of desire, affection, or will; every purpose of Deity having the delighted concurrence of the human soul, and every volition of the human soul the perfect approbation of Deity:—3. Because, in regard to any alleged impossibility of the union of infinite with finite, there is in this respect nothing more incomprehensible in the case, than there is in the connexion of the infinite nature of Deity with any and with every limited portion of space; so that there is as great perplexity felt in answering the question with respect to any place where we happen to be, How is God *here?* as in answering the question, How is Deity united with humanity in the person of Jesus Christ? and if, in the former case, our inability to answer produces no hesitation in our faith, why should it in the latter?

I repeat, that the question is one of *fact*, and of simple appeal to the authority of Scripture; and to enter into it further, would be to re-commence the controversy. I have only therefore to add, that I consider Mr. Yates's attempt to confound the intellects of his readers by his metaphysical playing upon the word *person*, to be in the present instance unworthy of him. Does he really conceive it fair to substitute the word MIND for PERSON, and to frame his argument as if they were synonymous? The *person* of a man, and the *mind* of a man, are surely not phrases of the same amount. There is, in the *person* of a man, a union of mind and body; a union, which is itself a mystery, such as we can no more explain than we

can explain the greater mystery of the union of the Divine nature with both in the person of Christ.

It is not less unworthy to affect to frighten me with the Scylla and Charybdis,—the heresy of the *Nestorians* and the heresy of the *Monothelites*. In attempting, with prayer for divine direction, to form my judgment on such matters from the Scriptures, I feel myself very independent of either Nestorians or Monothelites, or any other *ites* or *orians*, of which, and of other sectarian terminations, there has been a lamentable superfluity in the history of the Church. I wish to keep by the question, with whomsoever the result may associate me—"What is written in the Law? How readest thou?"

My opponent, moreover, quotes the language of different Trinitarian writers, as if I were answerable for every objectionable mode of expression which may have been employed by all who have spoken or written on that side of the controversy. Mr. Yates himself has more than once disavowed sentiments and expressions employed by Priestley and Belsham and other Unitarians. For these, therefore, I should think it wrong to make *him* personally answerable, and insist upon his defending and justifying them. Neither do I feel myself called upon to offer a single comment, either in the way of defence or condemnation, on the language of others. I answer only to my own indictment.

Mr. Yates says (page 166, 167)—"If the doctrine be such as Dr. Wardlaw seems now to represent it, there is nothing mysterious or wonderful in it. We are told of two distinct minds, a divine and a human, each retaining its peculiar properties. These two minds are said indeed to be united. But to what does this assertion amount? Are not the minds of all intelligent beings in some sense *united* to God? Are not all created things *united* into one system? May not the mind of every prophet or inspired person be said to be in a more especial manner *united* to the Divine Mind?" But why trifle thus, and play with words? In whatever sense the mind of any creature may be said to be united to God,—the question recurs, Is it in *such* a sense as to entitle that creature to the ascription to him of the NAMES, ATTRIBUTES, WORKS, and WORSHIP, belonging to the one Jehovah? This we affirm to be the case, according to the Scriptures, with regard to the union in the person of Christ. And this brings us back to where we began

more than sixteen years ago; and to what I have written in that controversy I have nothing to add in the pages of the Christian Pioneer;—a designation, by the way, of which, while I give it in courtesy as the assumed Title of your Miscellany, I shall not of course be considered as approving. I regard it, as I regard every association of the term *Christian* with *Unitarianism*, as a misnomer.

I have now done. If my opponent chooses to reply again, he shall have the last word.

I am, Sir,

Yours sincerely,

RALPH WARDLAW.

GLASGOW, April 14th, 1829.

Letters addressed to a small Unitarian Congregation, by their former Minister.

LETTER II.

CHRISTIAN BRETHREN,

In the present letter, I shall confine myself to some remarks on the important advantages of public worship, and I hope that you will give them your serious attention. Nothing would afford me a purer pleasure than to know that my letters are conducive to your spiritual improvement; and as I write through the medium of a periodical, and on subjects of a general nature, I am not without hope of their being useful to others.

It must be admitted that every human action which has immediate reference to God, is of vital and supreme importance to man. In every thing relating to the Divinity, our highest interests are deeply involved; and it becomes us, as the subjects of a moral government, to consider well the situation in which we are placed, and the nature of the duties which we are called to perform. No one who believes in the existence of a God, will deny that it is our duty to worship him. And this duty, my friends, is the highest and most sacred in which we can possibly be engaged. Think on the greatness and incomprehensibility of that Being whom you are called upon to adore. He is the creator of unnumbered worlds, the preserver of universal nature, and though he governs the mighty universe, he hears the penitent's cry, and watches the sparrow's fall. As he is perfectly acquainted with the

minutest part of his immense creation, in his power and goodness, the humblest individual may safely confide. That it is our duty to worship him, is clearly written in the book of nature, and the book of grace. That it is our interest to pay him reverence, the experience of the wise and good of every country and of every creed, abundantly confirms. The contemplation of the works of nature, leads the devotional mind to something that is superior to nature, nature's God. The outward universe bespeaks an agent, whose power is every where felt, but no where understood. By every mind his agency is recognized, and his perfection by every heart adored:—

> "The untaught Indian, whose untutored mind,
> Sees God in clouds, and hears him in the wind."

But you, my brethren, enjoy a fuller developement of the mind and purposes of God, of the nature and object of your worship, than can be gathered from the teachings of natural religion. You are in possession of the Sacred Volume which contains the Christian revelation, and enjoy the light which it conveys to the mind, and the blessings which it imparts to the contrite and believing heart. You find, that nature and Christianity, in blessed concord, unite in proclaiming but one infinite Father, whom they command you to reverence and adore.

In showing the advantages derivable from public worship, I wish to be understood as having principally in view, Unitarian worship, or the worship of One God in *one person*. Not but that some of my remarks will apply to Trinitarian worship, though I believe not with equal propriety and force. I am far, however, from supposing, and I particularly request you to bear this in mind, that all other forms of worship beside that which you have adopted, are incapable of producing the genuine feelings of piety and devotion in the breasts of their sincere adherents. I cannot represent Trinitarianism, under any of its modifications, as a system of polytheism, and charge its believers with idolatry. No; this would not only be uncharitable, but notoriously unjust. Though the Trinitarian worships three distinct persons of one essence, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, yet he will not admit that he worships *three Gods*, nor that he pays supreme homage to the human nature of Christ, but solely to those eternal and immutable perfections which he supposes to be inherent in the divine nature of the Son. I make these remarks, not

because I feel any growing inclination towards Trinitarianism; for I must confess, the more I examine it, the more unscriptural and inexplicable it appears; but with the view of cautioning you against the employment of any harsh and uncharitable language, which does not convey clearly your own ideas, and wounds severely the feelings of others. I rejoice to find, that a reformation has commenced among Trinitarians, especially in the language of public devotion. The greater part (so far as I have had an opportunity of judging) of the extemporaneous prayers that are offered up by dissenting congregations, are almost exclusively addressed to the *Father*, through the mediation of the Son. I have no recollection of ever having heard an extemporaneous prayer addressed exclusively to the Holy Spirit, which omission clearly indicates that the simple worship taught and observed by Jesus, "*when ye pray, say, Our Father,*" would in most cases be practically adhered to, were not the mind of the worshipper chained down by human formularies and unscriptural creeds. But, my brethren, in the worship which you have adopted, you meet with no incongruities, no conflicting principles; your minds are not perplexed amidst a plurality of divine persons: you look to one, and only one, as the object of your adoration—your friend and Father in heaven. As Unitarians, yours is the worship of nature, of reason, of Christ. The unity of design which the universe every where exhibits, is one of the strongest arguments of reason for the unity of its divine Author. And the Saviour of the world has abundantly confirmed this vital truth, shadowed forth in nature, by more clearly revealing, in all their energy and loveliness, the oneness and perfections of the Almighty Creator. To him you are taught to go, as children to a Father; to know him, your Saviour has said, is "life eternal," and to worship him aeceptably, must be "in spirit and in truth."

One of the chief advantages attendant on public worship, is, that it brings us nearer to God. By preparing the mind for serious meditation and prayer, it unloads us of the burden of worldly anxieties and cares, and enables us to hold sweet communion with our heavenly Father. This, my brethren, is the highest advantage—the most inestimable blessing that we can possess on earth. To draw near to God in social acts of worship, is to form a closer resemblance to every thing that is excellent, sublime, and

perfect. It gives us a knowledge of our own deficiencies and wants, and conducts us to that Fountain of infinite purity and blessedness, from which alone they can be supplied. Never does human nature exhibit so gloriously the Maker of its heavenly origin and destination—never does it manifest so practically its intimate relation with the Divinity, as when sincerely and ardently engaged in the sacred exercises of devotion. By these means, man is taught the true value and dignity of his own nature; he is led to appreciate the great end of his being; earth is connected with heaven, and every dispensation of unerring wisdom and infinite benevolence, is so far understood as to be practically improved. That the conscientious discharge of the duties of public worship, tends to bring the mind into this happy and exalted state, will be allowed by every one that is experimentally acquainted with the subject. A reference to others, to any but those who know from delightful experience, that "it is a good thing to wait upon the Lord," would be wholly in vain. To enjoy the pure delights arising from the public and social services of Christian worship, the mind must be enlightened by the great truths of religion, and the heart penetrated with their sacred and ennobling influences. I am, however, far from supposing, that a regular attendance on public worship on the Sabbath, is *alone* sufficient for the attainment of moral and Christian excellence. Indeed, a *mere bodily* attendance, so far as it regards the advancement of individual piety and improvement, is little better than no attendance at all. True religion, my friends,—that which can really improve our characters and elevate our souls, is an affair of the understanding and the heart. It is not merely a weekly business—it is not a thing that requires our attention only on the Sunday, it is our daily, our hourly concern. What is religion? Not merely public worship, baptism, or the Lord's supper. These are indeed some of its most solemn ordinances or means, but they do not constitute religion itself. Real and practical religion, the only religion valuable to man, consists in the proper regulation of the life, the governing of the temper and affections, and the continual enlargement and elevation of the human soul. This is a great concern. You will acknowledge, my friends, that you cannot give it too much attention, or observe it too closely every day, nay, every hour of your lives. Let me entreat you, then, not to leave

your religion in your place of worship on the Sabbath, but to carry the instructions and influences you have acquired there, to your families and your homes. Communicate them to your children and domestics, and you will inspire them with a love, and induce them to the practice of a vital and exalted piety. Make religion the object of your perpetual care; adopt her as your constant companion, and you will ever find her an unfailing friend. "Her ways are ways of pleasantness, and all her paths are peace."

(To be Concluded in our next.)

The Protestant Methodists.

A secession from the Wesleyan Methodists, has, we have already informed our readers (Vol. III. p. 65–69), lately taken place at Leeds and the vicinity, brought about by the tyrannical proceedings of the leaders of Methodism. It is not now necessary to enter into a detail of the various events which have led to the present secession; these have been stated in the Pioneer. But having watched the progress of both parties—the one justly resisting tyrannical impositions, the other consisting of the chief priests in the Methodist connection, earnestly endeavouring to bind fast the yoke of servitude on the necks of the oppressed people—we are prepared to assert, that if the dissentients at Leeds had not cast off the chains of the Conference, they would have been unworthy of the liberty wherewith Christ has made them free, and of the honourable name of free-born Englishmen. Nor do we hesitate to declare, in the words of the dissentients, that "inquisitorial tyranny" has marked the proceedings against them, "and Jesuitical insincerity been employed in the attempt to justify them"—by the sanction and adoption of which, the Methodist Conference has embodied in itself many of the revolting features of two of the most odious institutions that have sprung from the corruptions of Popery; namely, the Inquisition and Jesuitism.

The Seceders have taken the name of Protestant Methodists. In the immediate neighbourhood of Leeds, their number and character are respectable. A feeling of sympathy with them is already extensively prevalent, and is every day extending itself. At Barnsley in Yorkshire, at Preston in Lancashire, in the City of York, at Newark in

Nottinghamshire, at Halifax in Yorkshire, societies have been formed. The attention of the great body of the Methodist community is awakened to their liberties and to the tyranny of the preachers. Much ferment prevails in many parts of the kingdom, and we hope, and are disposed to believe, that a crisis is at hand. We conceal not our hatred of Methodistic government; and the sooner it falls, the greater will be our joy. Stand long, we do hope it cannot in the present day; for the tyranny is too galling to be long endured. The preachers have acted as complete despots, and so oppressed the people, that inquiry will lead to speedy ruin. One fear has prevented many from openly declaring against the Conference—the fear of injuring their piety, in the warfare which must ensue in secession. We respect the motive, but we deprecate the apprehension. To all such, we would say, Do your duty, and leave the issue to God. Peculiar junctures require peculiar exertions; and for every advantage, a price must be paid. But scarcely can the possession of liberty be rated at too high a value—liberty, without which, religion is converted into superstition, and a love of peace into a sin.

To encourage the spirit which begins to prevail, the Protestant Methodists have commenced the publication of a Magazine, which will not lose in comparison with any other of the religious periodicals issued by the orthodox. The editors deserve great praise for offering to expose well-authenticated instances of oppression. "Having received information," they say, "of several instances of most arbitrary conduct on the part of some of the preachers, especially in small circuits, where the people do not know how to defend themselves, we take this opportunity of remarking, that our columns will always be open for communications of this description, provided they be properly authenticated."

Methodist preachers are generally considered poor, but the ministers of no one sect in England, of equal attainments, are better paid. Nay, we doubt not, that, with the exception of the higher Church clergy, no spiritual teachers are, upon the average, so well paid as the Methodist preachers. The generality of dissenting ministers receive a much better education than Methodist preachers, yet are their emoluments considerably less. For the support of Methodist preachers, a skilful plan has been adopted—a

plan by which the enjoyment of good means, has been united with the appearance of poverty. This plan is, to derive the payment from several quarters; each small in itself, and escaping notice, or impressing the observer with the idea of paucity; yet so numerous are these quarters, that the streams proceeding from them, make, when viewed together, no contemptible appearance. It has been calculated, that the sum appropriated to the remuneration of Methodist preachers, amounts to £198,028. This is to be divided amongst 1146 persons, and gives to each the annual sum of £173. In some cases, less; but in others, much more, than this is received: and it is believed that the calculation is rather below than above the actual amount. We have said before, that the quarters are numerous whence this amount is gathered. There is quarterage, board, servants, allowance for children, education of children, either at Kingswood or Woodhouse Grove schools, doctors' bills, house bills, coals, candles, stationery, rent, taxes; the superintendent of each district allowed £10 per cent. on the sale of magazines and other books, netting, in some circuits, £30 or £40 per annum. In no other body except the Church, does the average of ministers' salaries amount, we are sure, to any thing like the sum of £170 per annum. Such are the advantages which accrue to ministers, from keeping, as with the Methodists, all legislative power in their own hands. Yes, Conference knows its own interests; but, like other cunning folks, it may lose its advantages by a narrow-minded policy. In the above calculation, no allowance is made for chance supplies, in the shape of fat things full of marrow—the free-will offerings of private individuals. Yet, partly as the Methodist preachers are thought poor, partly as the piety of their disciples is warm and generous, no class of ministers, we are disposed to think, reap so abundant a harvest from individual bounty. We do not grudge them their gettings; but we wish to correct the idea that they are poor. We do not think they are too large; but considering the tastes, the pursuits, and the previous lot of many of the receivers, we think they are, upon an average, sufficient; and provided they did not aim at enslaving their followers, and checking the progress of liberal ideas, we should have no controversy with them, save and except on the unscriptural dogmas which they teach the people.

G. C. S.

On the Co-operative System.

"All that believed were together, and had all things common," Acts ii. 44.

THERE are some subjects, which, to a superficial observer, may appear improper for publication, and may require an apology from the author. The co-operative system, may probably be considered in this point of view. It attacks the prejudices of a vast portion of the community, who are apprehensive that an inroad may be made upon their property; and even the philosopher is apprehensive, that the Utopian schemes of the philanthropist, may be untenable, and injurious to the permanent interest of mankind. Let it be, however, remembered, that similar objections have been made to the introduction of every improvement, either in morals or science. The voice of Demetrius was raised against the zealous Apostle of Christianity, because his craft was in danger; and Galileo the great astronomer, and Harvey the discoverer of the circulation of the blood, met with hosts of enemies, who endeavoured to blast their characters, to oppose their scientific discoveries, and ruin their peace of mind. Can we, therefore, be surprised, that the friends of the co-operative system should meet with opposition, and their benevolent motives be misrepresented? Or can we wonder that the sons of avarice should be alarmed lest their wealth should be deprived of its baneful influence upon the peace and happiness of the community?*

Of so much importance do I consider this subject, that I am persuaded, it is impossible for either knowledge or virtue to make any considerable progress, until *men have all things in common.* How the golden precept of Christ, "love your neighbour as yourself," can be carried into effect, so long as the present disorganized and selfish state of society continues, I cannot imagine. Nay, I will venture to say, it is absolutely impossible for any human being to love his fellow-creatures with the same ardent affection as he loves himself, so long as he is taught by a sinful generation, to consider his own individual happiness the chief object of his life.

Undoubtedly, Sunday schools, mechanics' institutes, and

* Of all the insulting attacks upon the human understanding, surely there are none greater than the pretensions of mere men of property. Riches, exclaims the worldling, should have an influence in society. Yes, replies the philosopher, when they are attended by wisdom and virtue, but not otherwise.

other intellectual engines, may, for a time, sap the foundation of moral turpitude, and check the tendency of vice; but rest assured, the evils of poverty, and the influence of riches, will either retard the efforts of the philanthropist, or completely subvert the effects of his benevolence. Without referring to past events to confirm the truth of this assertion, I need only refer to the distressing condition of the working class in this country, who are compelled, by their unfortunate situation, to remain in the darkness of ignorance, and frequently in the bond of iniquity. They cannot afford to resort to the fountains of knowledge, and their minds being almost continually engaged in anxious solicitude for the maintenance of themselves and families, how is it possible for them to devote their attention to the improvement of their minds, and the cultivation of virtue?†

We cannot also turn our eyes to any part of the Globe, and not see the hand of man raised against his brother. There is a continual wrestling and combating among the children of the world. They seldom endeavour to raise the fallen, but, on the contrary, are absorbed in an ardent desire to throw their competitors from the tower of prosperity, that they may climb its walls and take possession of their adversaries' places. They look upon every rival with a jealous eye, or as an interloper who would deprive them of their assumed privileges.

Nor are those individuals who are surrounded with all the boasted advantages of wealth and rank, any better off than the hard-working labourer, whose pittance is earned by the sweat of his brow. Listlessness, selfishness, and every unholy passion, too frequently haunt their habitations; and while they seem, to the thoughtless observer, possessed of peace and happiness, their hearts are often weighed down with anxiety and remorse. The carriages which roll through the streets of our great towns, would, if they could find utterance, speak of the discontent and misery of their owners; and the spacious gardens and parks

† It is not contended that every poor man is miserable; for daily experience teaches us, that when the necessaries of life can be procured, happiness is not confined to any class or condition of mankind. But then be it remembered, that as the poor are generally unable to improve their moral and intellectual faculties, they consequently *do not fulfil the design of their existence*, which is, not to live a mere animal life, but as rational and accountable agents, or as the children of God, and the destined heirs of immortality.

of our great men, are frequent witnesses of the wretchedness of the envied higher orders of society.

Now, can it be supposed that a wise and good Being, whose providence presides over the affairs of men, ever intended that this state of things should continue; or that the friend of religion can believe, that it can ever have its proper influence upon the heart, till the present selfish system gives way to that holy community, where men may live together as brethren, and, like the primitive Christians, place their goods in one common stock, and be of one heart and of one soul?

The friends of this system, or of co-operative institutions, lay before the world a plan, which is at once simple and comprehensive. Their system, so far from being Utopian, or impossible to be effected, is, on the contrary, conducted upon the same principles as the management of a large family. They require no sacrifice of human and religious obligations. No man is demanded to break the ties of consanguinity; nor is any one suffered to intrude upon his domestic privacy.* It is true, every individual must work,† and place the fruits of his industry in the hands of his brother members. It is true, also, that there will be no tyrannical masters, nor servile dependants, as all will enjoy equal rights and privileges, and manage the affairs of the community, either by themselves or their representatives.‡ But it is likewise certain, that every man will have time for amusement§ and instruction,‖ and

---

* Every adult will have an apartment to himself, although he will be expected to take his meals in the public room.

† It was a laudable custom among the Jews, for every youth to learn a trade; and it is only a false shame that makes any handicraft a disgrace. Epaminondas thought it an honour to hold any situation in which his country employed him, although, through the envy of his enemies, he was made overseer of the Theban scavengers. If the same sentiment were impressed upon the minds of children by their friends and tutors, every employment would be thought equally respectable by them.

‡ The various officers of every co-operative society would be chosen annually, by ballot and universal suffrage, so that no one would have cause to complain of any of its laws or regulations.

§ In consequence of the division of labour, and the introduction of every kind of machinery, the members would be only required to devote a few hours a-day to their respective employments, while the remainder of their time might be employed in amusement and instruction. Dancing, music, bowling, and many other innocent amusements, would be provided in every community.

‖ An excellent library, a philosophical apparatus, and other means of communicating instruction, would be provided by the societies, for the benefit of all the members.

will never be compelled to flatter the rich and powerful, nor indulge the unholy feelings of pride and tyranny.* Religion, which, in the present state of society, is the source of contention and ecclesiastical domination, will be of too sacred a nature to be interfered with by any human being. Every man will be allowed to worship God according to the dictates of his conscience; and the eyes of the Christian, and the philosopher, will at last be gratified with the glorious exhibition of all sects and parties living together in brotherly love, and offering up that incense to the Creator, which they shall conceive most acceptable in his sight. Why, indeed, should not truth be investigated, and amicable disputations employed by serious inquirers, without the unholy feelings and angry language of bigoted polemics? Why, indeed, should not men agree to differ, and unite in the holy cause of endeavouring to possess right notions of God and his dispensations? Both religion and reason teach us, that while we are to know the truth, and prove all things, we must also hold fast that which is good, and love one another. "Now abideth faith, hope, charity, these three, but the greatest of these is charity."† I might here refer to the able writings of Mr. Owen, and other philanthropists, upon the advantages of having all things in common. I might prove, that by living together as one family, the earth would bring forth more abundantly; that by a proper division of labour,‡ the fruits of industry

---

* In the present immoral state of society, how many evils may be ascribed to the servile dependence of the poor? This dependence not only debases the mind of the servant, but fills the breast of the master with tormenting and unholy feelings, so that it is difficult to say who would be the most benefited—the rich or the poor—by an equal division of property.

† Should it be said, that if the ministers of the gospel were obliged to work at some trade or profession, they would be unqualified to instruct their fellow-creatures in the principles of religion, I reply, that supposing regular ministers to be necessary for teaching the doctrines of Christianity, which, however, is very doubtful, yet surely they might be content to imitate the Apostles, who worked at some handicraft; or the many poor parsons of this country, who are compelled either to keep schools, cultivate farms, or live in penury. I am not aware, too, that the lay preachers of truth and righteousness, are worse parsons than the regularly educated clergy of our church establishment; nor do I say they are better.

‡ The following admirable remarks on the division of labour by Adam Smith, are too excellent to be omitted in an essay of this description. They prove to demonstration, that by a proper division of labour, the daily work of a co-operative society might be soon finished, and its members allowed an abundance of time for instruction and amusement.

would be quadrupled;* but I shall proceed to show more particularly, the moral influence which the co-operative system must have upon the human conduct, and which will, I hope, convince the most sceptical reader, that the change here proposed, is worthy the attention of every sincere philanthropist. BARNABAS.

(To be Continued.)

"The greatest improvements in the productive powers of labour," says that able philosopher, "and the greater part of the skill, dexterity, and judgment, with which it is any where directed or applied, seem to have been the effects of the division of labour. To take an example from a very trifling manufacture, but one in which the division of labour has been very often taken notice of, the trade of a pin-maker: a workman not educated to this business—which the division of labour has rendered a distinct trade, not acquainted with the use of machinery employed in it—could scarce, perhaps, with his utmost industry, make one pin in a day, and certainly could not make twenty. But in the way in which this business is now carried on, not only the whole work is a peculiar trade, but it is divided into a number of branches, of which the greater part are likewise peculiar trades. One man draws out the wire, another straights it, a third cuts it, a fourth points it, a fifth grinds it at the top for receiving the head; to make the head, requires two or three distinct operations; to put it on is a peculiar business; to whiten the pins is another; it is even a trade by itself to put them into the paper; and the important business of making a pin, is in this manner divided with about eighteen distinct operations, which, in some manufactories, are all performed by distinct hands, though in others the same man will sometimes perform two or three of them. I have seen a small manufactory of this kind where ten men only were employed, and where some of them, consequently, performed two or three distinct operations. But though they were very poor, and therefore but indifferently accommodated with the necessary machinery, they could, when they exerted themselves, make among them about twelve pounds of pins in a day. There are in a pound upwards of 4000 pins of a middling size. Those ten persons, therefore, could make among them upwards of 48,000 pins in a day. Each person, therefore, making a tenth part of 48,000 pins, might be considered as making 4,800 pins in a day. But if they had all wrought separately and independently, and without any of them having been educated to this peculiar business, they certainly could not each of them have made twenty, perhaps not one pin in a day; that is certainly not the two hundred and fortieth, perhaps not the four thousand eight hundredth part of what they are at present capable of performing in consequence of a proper division and combination of their different operations.

In every other art and manufacture (and he might have said, in every co-operative society), the effects of the division of labour are similar to what they are in this very trifling one, though in many of them the labour can neither be so much subdivided, nor reduced to so great a simplicity of operation."

* Steam engines and every other mechanical invention, should be introduced into co-operative societies, for the purpose of lessening manual labour, and of enriching the public capital. By multiplying power-looms and other machinery, we may be said to increase our population, without increasing our expenses.

Letter to the Rev. William Thorpe, of Bristol.

[We have been favoured by a friend, with a copy of a "Letter to the Rev. William Thorpe," a minister in the Independent connexion at Bristol. It is, we believe, written by Dr. Carpenter. It appeared in one of the Bristol papers in February, and has since been reprinted as a pamphlet. Mr. Thorpe occupies the unenviable pre-eminence of having been the *only* dissenting minister, who at Bristol signed the requisition for a public meeting of the inhabitants, against justice being done to our Roman Catholic brethren. We gladly make the following extracts from this admirable letter, with our thanks to their author, for the good service he has again performed in behalf of truth and liberty.—*Edit.*]

"The great Protestant principles, are, the sufficiency of the Scriptures as a rule of faith, and the right of private judgment in deriving that rule from them. The Protestant Dissenter carries these principles to their full extent; and claims (as by the law of Christian equity he is obliged to yield to others) the unshackled enjoyment of that right. It is the inwrought habit of the consistent Dissenter, to maintain it, and to 'stand fast' against all that encroaches upon it,—whether from spiritual domination, or the needless interference of temporal power,—as an infringement on the allegiance due from him to the sole Lord of the Christian.

"Whatever annexes temporal evil of any kind, to the exercise or profession of religious opinions, whether by the infliction of disgrace and obloquy, of pain and fear, or of hatred and suspicion,—by injury to the peace, the property, the domestic charities, the civil rights and privileges, the influence and respectability of another,—or, by the destruction of liberty or of life,—is an infringement on the rights of conscience: and, however inflicted,—whether by the power of the tongue, the pen, or the sword,—by the strong arm of human law and temporal dominion, or by the no less powerful *influence* of the press or the pulpit,—such infringement on the rights of conscience is a species of persecution. My peace and good name are dearer to me than money; my power of usefulness than my liberty, or even my life: if you destroy the former, you persecute me more pungently, though with more refined torture, than if you employ the arm of civil authority to inflict on me fines, imprisonment, and death."

"It is no justification of exclusive laws, to point out absurdities or evil tendencies in the *present* religious peculiarities of the Catholics; still less to show what *has been* the spiritual tyranny of the Church of Rome, and to reprobate abuses in it which the intelligent among them would reprobate also. As in other denominations of Christians, the great essential practical principles of the Gospel have a vital influence, which prevents numberless evils that might arise from human additions; and it is impossible to think of Fenelon, and De Sales, and the author of *Thomas a Kempis*, and multitudes of others among the wise and the good of past times, brought up as Catholics, —it is impossible to read the practical writings which are prevalent among them now, and witness the exemplary lives of their clergy and many others,—without perceiving that the life of God, in the heart, is not destroyed by those errors of the head which are not permitted to foster its sinful tendencies."

"It is Protestant intolerance, which, in our country, gives the chief support to that exclusive, separating system, which we attribute to the influence of their Priests. Treat the Catholics *justly* and *kindly*, and you will find they *are* brethren: you will find that they *can* fall in with the enlightening and liberalizing spirit of the times. I say so because I *know* they DO. I have before me a letter written by a *Catholic Priest* to a Dissenting Minister, soon after the repeal of the Test Acts. 'Thank God!' he says, 'religious liberty (without which *civil* freedom is but an empty name) now begins to be understood by all classes. My conscience tells me, [and all who know him can bear witness with his conscience,] that I have done my best, in my very humble sphere, to inculcate, that religion is the relation of man to his Creator; that no human law has any right to dictate a religious creed to the subject; that to punish him by civil pains for adherence to his conscientious convictions, is unjust and cruel; and that the attempt to legislate for Heaven, is impious.' —Would that every Protestant would learn of this Catholic Priest, and go and do likewise.

"This lesson the Catholics have learned by the intolerance of others: a Dissenting Minister, even without recollections of the early days of his ancestors, should have imbibed these noble principles with the earliest instructions he received.

"But suppose the Catholics unchanged, and as much disposed as ever to that intolerant spirit which the Exclusionists manifest, how little is the alarm which you have shared and propagated, supported by the FACTS *of the case.* Is there any absurdity chargeable on what they call Popery, greater than that of maintaining, that at most seventy or eighty Catholic members of the Commons, could overpower the remaining mass of Protestants? And, IF they did, that a *dozen* Catholic noblemen could overpower the Bench of Protestant Bishops,—to leave out of reckoning the great bulk of Protestant Peers? And, IF they did, that a Protestant King would forget the rights of the majority of his subjects, and the tenure of his crown, and expose himself to that forfeiture of it, which, for his now proposing to the Parliament to do justice to ALL, has been daringly held up to alarm him, by some of the Journals of the day? And, IF all this did take place, that the Protestant influence of the great mass of intelligence, culture, wealth, and energy of our nation, would not outweigh the whole? I should rather say, *that influence* MUST PREVENT *the whole, and renders every part impossible.*"

"Have confidence, Sir, in the influence of *Public Opinion.* It never was greater than at present; and the strongest influence of it is essentially *Protestant.* Either the Catholic must take his share in the liberalizing spirit of the times, in proportion to which he is not to be feared; or that influence will always outweigh him, and render him powerless to disturb our Institutions.

"Have confidence in those *Institutions.* The Catholic rejoices in them as you do. His ancestors (the ancestors of the very Peers whose exclusion from their hereditary rights you would now continue) obtained for England the Magna Charta. In proportion as he is permitted to share the advantage of the constitution, will he love and venerate it. No heart is warmer or more devoted than *his,* who, after having been long oppressed, is released from degradation and thraldom, and finds himself treated as a man and a brother.

"Have confidence in your *King* and in his *Government.* They could not have changed, one and all, without a full conviction of the vast preponderance of the evils of continued exclusion. They expose themselves to obloquy and desertion: it must be from a conviction of public duty.

"Have confidence in your *Legislature*. Many even of those who are not prepared for the views of religious liberty which you and I possess as our birthright, as well as those who have long shared them with us, see the tempest gathering, and ready to burst; and before it is too late would 'save the ship.' Can you suppose that you can see as far as those who are on higher stations; or that you are more devoted than they in your attachments to the Protestant Faith?

"And have confidence in that *Faith*. I believe it rests on the Scriptures of Truth, and on the free-born nature of the human mind. It will extend, I doubt not, with the possession of rights long withheld. Let the Roman Catholic stand upright as a fellow-subject, and he will listen to your arguments. Oppression and injustice close his heart; and the heart is the best gate to the understanding. They operate on him as your terrors do on you.

"But no terrors should prevent the exercise of the Law of Equity. Obedience to *this*, in the concerns of nations, as of individuals, God in his gracious Providence, will make to prosper. It is his own Law; and no law of man should interfere with it; none can without evil."

"I address you, Sir, with earnestness, but it is the earnestness of long-tried, and deep, and growing conviction. I think of you, not as an individual, but as one who influences many. I believe your influence is at least as submissively received by many, as that power which the Catholic Priest has over his community. It is not too late to stop, if it be to retrieve, your erroneous and baneful use of it. I warn you to remember, that you, also, as well as myself, are a Briton, and

A Protestant Dissenter.

THE CHRISTIAN PIONEER.

Glasgow, *May* 1, 1829.

The Catholic Question is settled. A light has suddenly shone in a dark place, and an evil of enormous magnitude is no more. In 1813, we, as Christian Unitarians, were released by legislative enactment from the pains and penalties, even to loss of liberty, of property, nay of life, which previously attached to the profession of our principles. During the last year, an act of justice was unexpectedly done, which concerned us also, as Dissenters from the Church by law established. For these things we were thankful, and are so still. By these our hearts were conciliated, still more than they had previously been, to the institutions and government of our country. But for ourselves we must say, we heard not of these acts of justice with half the pleasure that we felt when the news reached us, half incredulous, yet full of hope —wavering, like the early disciples, between joy and fear, when they "believed not for joy, and wondered," that our Roman Catholic brethren, so long a degraded caste, the objects of pity, or of disesteem, of whom prejudice grudgingly allowed even candour to think and speak in honourable terms, that these fellow sufferers for conscience sake, these, of all men, in their own native land, the most miserable, and through the United Kingdom, watched with jealousy, were, by an act worthy of that pre-eminent justice and mercy, which, by a poetic license, we are wont to ascribe to Royalty, speedily to be admitted as good subjects, to the full enjoyment of the privileges of the British community. It was indeed grateful to hear it declared, that the great question which has so long agitated the nation in its length and in its breadth, in the councils of its Monarch, and the councils of its Parliament, was to be settled, on the broad basis, that no man should be injured in his civil rights, on account of his religious opinions—to hear this declared by those who have proved themselves to have had the power to execute the righteous purpose, and not, as too often heretofore declared, as a truth, at which the majority grew alarmed, the timid shrunk back, the designing and interested scowled, and which, therefore, it required extraordinary honesty and firmness of purpose to mention and to recommend. Now, may we not indeed hope, that a new era has commenced? now, may we not believe in the reality of the much-talked of march of intellect? now, may we not indulge in pleasing anticipations of the future? For the emancipation of religion from the unholy alliance with the civil power, something has been done, and more, the past authorizes us to expect. Soon, we trust, the mighty and inflated nothings with which on many topics the passions of men have been agitated and swayed, will appear in all their native inanity, to astonish men, not by their terrors but on account of their own infatuation. To interfere in religion, either to restrain, or, as it is falsely called, to protect, will, we fervently hope, nay expect, appear as absurd

as the sumptuary laws that are now obsolete, and which went to regulate the cost of an entertainment, or the shape of a shoe, or the fashion of a coat. We now look back with wonder and abhorrence, on the dreadful acts of the inquisition. A Galileo immured in prison for teaching astronomical truth, and compelled, by pains and penalties, to recant his errors, excites for him our warmest sympathy, and, in respect of his persecutors, our reprobation, and of the age in which such deeds of darkness happened, our astonishment and pity. And after not many years, shall the pains and penalties against the holding, or the publication of religious opinions, which have disgraced this age and country—and after not many generations, shall the miscalled favours of the State towards religion, the protection, the pomp, the dignity which it bestows, be reckoned among all strange and unaccountable things. What should we *now* think of the magistrate interposing to regulate the inquiries of the chemist, to determine the creed of the lawyer, to define the profession of the surgeon, and his method of practice, to protect the truths of mental or moral philosophy? Should he attempt to legislate for the scientific or the literary world, his attempt would be laughed to scorn. Equally absurd will appear his interposition in behalf of, or in opposition to, what he may deem religious truth or religious error, when in the lapse of years, prejudice shall have had its hold on the mind loosened, and sound reason and sound principles shall have assumed its place. Happy era this for our fellow-creatures, and happy are we, though we see the promised land but at a distance; and thankful ought we to be to those whose wisdom saw, and whose firmness originated those measures, which, we trust, from their importance in the political salvation of our common country, it is no desecration of Scriptural language, to call "the day-spring from on high."

But our exultation implies, that the evils from which our fellow-countrymen have been liberated, were great and pressing. And the fact of the existence of such evils in the nineteenth century of the Christian era, may well also excite emotions, very different from those of exultation. Nearly two thousand years ago, the principle which has just been recognised, guided for a brief period the conduct of the Roman government under the Emperor Julian. During the interval which has elapsed from that time till the present, this principle has been there almost entirely inert, and only partially, and in a few instances, in other countries and other realms, known and acted upon by earthly rulers. Thus does the human race, in some of its subdivisions, sometimes retrograde, and only after long intervals, whilst the light of knowledge and of liberty passes to other lands, regain the advantages they once possessed. But let us not suppose, that this retrogradation takes place in consequence of any fate or necessity which is independent of ourselves. In these matters, at least, we are the fabricators of our own condition. The ground which has now been regained, may be as quickly lost, if we remain inactive and indifferent. But if we are true to our duty, ourselves, our posterity, our species, we may make our present acquisitions a permanent possession for ourselves, and a per-

manent heritage for our children's children. And so in every subsequent age, if men recede instead of advancing, they have themselves alone to blame. There is a tide in the affairs of men, a flow and an ebb of prosperity; but unlike the tide of the ocean, it obeys the power of man, and yields to the control of a united people.

The great though tardy act of justice, the advent of which we have now hailed, may lead also to believe, that sustained efforts in a righteous cause will sooner or later meet with their reward. The friends of human improvement—of religious truth, are sometimes discouraged, in observing the great disproportion which they see to exist, between their labours and the apparent and immediate results. Year after year they toil for the attainment of a desirable object, they persevere through evil and through good report; in hope, they labour against hope, and when hope is gone, they walk by faith; and after all, alas! in how many cases, die without the sight! Instances of the exercise of those sublime virtues, the annals of Christian Unitarianism abundantly supply. And when we recollect the important fact, that the 18th of March last, the day when the second reading of the bill for the emancipation of our Roman Catholic brethren, was carried by a triumphant majority in the House of Commons, was just fifty years since the first motion for the removal of these odious laws, was brought forward by a revered statesman, whose memory will ever be associated with freedom of conscience and rational liberty, need we to be surprised, at what some may deem to be the comparatively slow progress of our principles in the popular mind? Witnessing the stubbornness of prejudice, in relation to a case so palpably based on justice and right and Christian duty, surely in our peculiar religious circumstances, we have reason to thank God and take courage. We have also suggested to our memory, a host of worthies, who in union and in succession fought the battle of religious liberty, and fought it, too, as a fight of faith, and were gathered to their fathers—not in despair, not unrewarded, but rewarded only in the inward man of the heart, and by that certain expectation which the consciousness of a just cause, and of righteous efforts, will not fail to inspire in the mind of an upright and consistent man. Oh, that those excellent patriots could now contemplate the glorious results of their labours! for to them chiefly, we ascribe the happy event to which our gladdened sight is now directed. They, one after another, led the battle onward to victory, the cause onward to an issue, the degraded onward to their rights,—till him, the last, but not the least of all the honoured and departed band, who brought a nation to the borders of the promised country, but like the ancient legislator of another despised people, was not allowed, perhaps like him, for sins committed, to lead the sufferers to the actual possession of the unspeakable blessings of liberty and peace. However, the victory is declared, the cause is gained—gained when least expected, and through agents who toiled not for its advancement, but for its destruction. Let these remarkable facts teach us, that truth is omnipotent and must prevail; that no good effort is lost, that no

good cause will fail, but by the treachery or supineness or indifference of its friends; that in a day the most inauspicious to look upon, the triumph of justice and truth may be proclaimed, and in a manner, which to have hoped for, might have been taken as a token of insanity, the rights of the oppressed may be vindicated. From these facts let us take courage. Other abuses let us not spare. In other causes let us not faint. In ancient Rome it was deemed a mark of a bad citizen, to despair of the fortunes of the Republic; let us never injure the interests of truth, nor delay the triumphs of justice, by despairing of the human race, of the capabilities of man, of the blessings of Providence, nor of the power of righteous efforts.

In the meanwhile, it is our duty, and we trust, that pleasure and duty are combined, to lend our efforts, feeble though they may be, toward the emancipation of all our countrymen from civil disqualifications. We will not, at present, dilate on the remaining disabilities under which we as Dissenters lie; but let us not forget, that there are others, who are prejudiced in their civil rights and their station in society, for the honest maintenance of what they deem religious truth. All such disabilities must be removed; the Jew equally with the Christian, the unbeliever equally with the believer, has a right to worship God as to him it seemeth good —has a right to defend without fear, and propound without punishment, the opinions to the adoption of which he has been led. And high time is it, that Christians began to recompense in the best possible way, the ancient people of God—a people from whom we have received so many blessings, and who have so many claims to our indulgence and our sympathy—to recompense them for the innumerable and shameful evils, which, from age to age, they have suffered from the laws of this country. We must not relax or intermit our efforts, till it be acknowledged, in practice as well as in words, that the magistrate has no concern as to the holding or propagating of opinions, no right to favour or amerce any sect or party, whether in science, in philosophy, or in religion. How many feuds, how much heartburning, what bitter conversations would the recognition of such a principle preclude. Then, when interest no longer interposed its baneful and perverting influence, would even theologians learn to think, to preach, and to write, if not with an entire absence, yet with a subdued and softened tone of sectarian feeling. The craft would no longer be in danger; the loaves and fishes would cease to be at stake; and Truth, possessed only of an open field, and tried only by solid argument, would be treated fairly, understood fully, advocated triumphantly. Then every man would worship under his own vine and his own fig-tree, no one daring to make him afraid; and the puny broils which have lately agitated the nation, and the deadly passions which have influenced the heart, would give place to the feelings of a common humanity, a common citizenship, and a common heritage of rights. The Constitution would then be the foster-mother of us all, and not the unnatural step-dame of the majority. Under its broad and ample shade, as under that famous and sacred oak at Mamre, which tradition tells, the patriarch Abra-

ham planted, and under which on one yearly day of festival, pilgrims, it is said, of all the nations of the East, and professors of all its different creeds, assembled in peace and concord, meeting as brethren under the tent of a common Parent, forgetting or suspending all their differences, in the love and veneration of that in which they were all agreed,*—under the broad and ample shade of the British Constitution, will all those who bear the British name meet, not for a *day* of festival, but to *live* in the enjoyment of perpetual harmony and content—to live, not dissevered into castes and sects and parties, but as brethren—to live endeared one to another, and cherishing, with all the ardour of free and manly hearts, the institutions, the improvement, the moral stability, the intellectual dignity, the happiness, the liberties of their native land.

Yes, and whilst promoting these truly rational and Christian objects, and rejoicing in their increasing prevalence, and firmer establishment, our practice will manifest, that though the ocean constitutes the barrier of Britain, it cannot confine the good affections or limit the good wishes of her children. All men will have a share in them, for all men have a right to the blessings of equal laws, and a well established freedom. In behalf of the whole family of God, by whatever seas or mountains bounded, by whatever names or characters distinguished, in whatever clime situated, or by whatever complexion marked, will the prayer ascend to the all-gracious Father of creation, imploring Him to grant deliverance to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound, whether in the chains which corrode and torture the body, or those more galling and degrading fetters which despoil and embrute the soul.

Glasgow Unitarian Society.

The Unitarian Congregation of Glasgow are anxious to publish in the present volume of the Christian Pioneer, a list of the Donations given towards the liquidation of the debt on their Chapel. They request, therefore, that those individuals and fellowship funds, from whom donations have been promised, will remit the amount as early as possible.

At the same time, they earnestly and respectfully call on those individuals, congregations, and fellowship funds, that have not yet contributed, to come forward in their behalf. On the firm establishment of the Glasgow Society, depends, in a great measure, the progress of Christian Unitarianism throughout Scotland, and especially in its western portion. Were the Congregation relieved from the

† Professor Hurwitz's Introductory Lecture.

pressure of the debt on their Chapel, their efforts, combined with those of their minister, would be extended to several stations in their neighbourhood, where the good seed has already been sown, and where, by increased exertion and labour, considerable good might reasonably be expected to result.

To reform Jerusalem first, is a duty, not more pleasing than obligatory. And whilst it is gratifying to witness the wide sphere of usefulness opening in other countries, and claiming the aid of the Unitarians of Great Britain, yet when the fact is known, that THREE POUNDS *from* EACH *Unitarian Congregation in England*, would clear away all incumbrances from the Glasgow Society, placing it on a respectable and permanent basis, and enabling it more extensively to advocate those doctrines by which it is distinguished, the Congregation confidently anticipate, that objects capable of such easy and complete accomplishment, will meet with the cheerful, and immediate, and effectual support, of all the friends of Christian truth and righteousness.

Glasgow, April 23, 1829.

Sermons for the Use of Families.

THIS interesting volume of Sermons, edited by the Rev. J. R. Beard, of Salford, is now published. It contains thirty-two discourses on highly important practical subjects. We have not yet perused the whole; but those we have read, do honour to the talents, and Christian feeling and principle of their authors. We cheerfully and strongly recommend this volume to our readers. The first impression has been exhausted by the subscribers, but a second edition will be published, as soon as a sufficient number of subscribers come forward. Our readers cannot better serve themselves, and the cause of vital Christianity, than by procuring the volume for their own perusal, and that of their families. We shall be happy to receive their names.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

The communication of J. S. would be charged as an Advertisement. B. of Bristol, and D. S. of Liverpool, will accept thanks for pamphlets and Newspapers.

THE

CHRISTIAN PIONEER.

No. 34. JUNE, 1829. Vol. III.

Church Establishments.

(Concluded from p. 301.)

ALTHOUGH little respect is paid to the man whose conduct is at variance with his professions; though dereliction of principle is generally condemned, and integrity of character as universally eulogized, at least by those whose opinions are of any value, it is not always an easy task to act in strict unison with the sentiments of the heart or the unsophisticated decisions of the judgment. If virtue is occasionally arrayed in fine linen, she may be often found clothed in sackcloth. The wizard spells of interest and fashion enthral the firm resolve, and the bold and magnanimous avowal of private conviction withers beneath their glance. And such is the wayward fashion of the world, such the potent influence of the world's institutions, such the mighty domination exercised by custom, and such the unlimited deference paid to the figments of by-gone ages, that to combine unbending integrity with intellectual superiority, may require much fortitude and self-denial. Emolument, honour, fame, are not always the concomitants of unsullied consistency. .To rejoice in the sunshine of popularity, to receive the plaudits of the multitude, to be reverenced as a master mind, and reclining on literary honours, the acknowledged possessor of high attainments and vast erudition, to enjoy the dignities of his elevation in undisturbed serenity and ease, is far more congenial with a man's feelings, than by the avowal of proscribed, or obnoxious opinions, to be the object of public opprobrium, the scorn of the bigotted and ignorant, the victim of misrepresentation, contumely, and contempt, if not a sufferer from the violence of prejudice, or a martyr to the wild excesses of blind and infuriate zeal. This is the assured portion of him who assumes the character of a reformer, and nerves his soul, and bends all his energies and powers to the arduous task of stemming the impetuous torrent of popular and prevalent error. Contemplating these diffi-

culties, how many, alas! sink into apathy and indifference, whose exertions might have been highly beneficial, but who imagining the existence of insuperable obstacles, despair of effecting any good, and quail and truckle to the impositions of the world; or who leave the stern and rugged path of duty for the more pleasing one, perchance, selected by ambition, interest, or love of ease. And yet what ruin can be compared with that of a mind, "which endued with divine powers, enthrals itself to animal lusts; which makes gain its god; which has capacities of boundless and ever-growing love, and shuts itself up in the dungeon of private interests; which gifted with a self-directing power, consents to be a slave, and is passively formed by custom, opinion, and changing events; which living under God's eye, dreads man's frown or scorn, and prefers human praises to its own calm consciousness of virtue; which tamely yields to temptation, shrinks with a coward's baseness from the perils of duty, and sacrifices glory and peace in parting with self-control."* What truth is more evident, than that the man who possesses high intellectual attainments, is in duty bound to regulate his conduct by a corresponding standard of excellence? If his practice be not in unison with his acquirements, he is a traitor to his nature, despoiling humanity of its brightest and most noble feature—its approximating tendency to moral perfection, its advances to celestial intelligence, its manifestation of alliance with spiritual existence. His depravity is of deeper die than the taint with which Adam is said to have disfigured the escutcheon of his posterity, for he emblazons a melancholy and grovelling debasement, whilst possessing motives and incentives of the highest order. Nor are those less liable to the brand of culpability and dishonour, who being amply endowed with every requisite for the advantageous (and may we assert, successful?) pursuit of truth, reject the search as unimportant and unnecessary, or suffer the results of their inquiries to remain in undisturbed security, nay, even studiously conceal them from public view, nor ever for a moment entertain the thought of acting upon them themselves, or of imparting them to others.

In the formation of a religious character, integrity and singleness of purpose is indispensable; sincerity must be

---

* Channing.

essential to acceptableness with that great Searcher of hearts who will not be mocked. There is an awful criminality in obliterating the sincere convictions of the mind, or confining them in unbreathed seclusion, whilst publicly advocating and supporting, overtly or virtually, by precept or example, what is in secret believed to be erroneous. And to allow opinions to be denounced as heretical, or condemned as pernicious, without bearing testimony in their behalf, being fully persuaded of their truth, is mean, pusillanimous, and worthless; is far removed from the promptings of genuine philanthropy, of true magnanimity, of real greatness of soul, of ardent regard for the interests of truth, and the moral welfare and improvement of mankind; it is inconsistent with the duty due to God as the bestower of our faculties, and of our duty to Christ as his disciples; but it is the debasing allegiance tendered to the Baal of the world, by narrow and grovelling spirits, who know not, nor can conceive of a conscience pure and void of deceit, of the simplicity of virtue, of the guilelessness of integrity, but will, if requisite, descend to any evasive and dishonourable subterfuge, rather than openly and honestly avow and support their sentiments. Wiser than the children of light, their actions result, from, to them, far more influential principles than an unbiassed love of truth, and a fervid zeal for its dissemination.

The humble and sincere Christian, who worships not Mammon under any of his Proteus shapes; who by exercising the right of private judgment, assumes the privilege of using those powers with which his Creator has endowed him, and claims the freedom with which Christ has invested him, being unshackled by the clogs and fetters of human systems, has no knowledge of time-serving and expediency. He has no creeds to advocate, no formularies to support, no trammels to wear, but enrolling himself a votary of truth, avows that its possession and promulgation are correlative, and that principle and practice are inseparable. He therefore cannot reconcile with his duty, the sedulous concealment of tenets, which may be condemned as heretical by bigotry or prejudice; he dares not, under any circumstances, submit to a compromise with error; he will not permit, without an effort, the multifarious incongruities which have usurped the place and name of Christianity, to exercise a pestiferous influence over the best and most important interests of men. He

must give up all claim to benevolence, if he passively allows his fellow-creatures to remain in wandering mazes lost—to be overwhelmed in mental and spiritual darkness, whilst he is conscious of possessing superior enlightenment, and clear and pure perceptions of the radiance of divinity. Such conduct is irreconcileable with his duty to his fellow creatures, and surely his duty to God does not teach him to witness in sullen apathy, the character of a universal Father to be libelled, and calumniated, and traduced, by the ravings of folly; his love converted into unrelenting rigour—his justice into sanguinary vengeance—his universal and unbounded benevolence into partial favouritism; or to allow his very existence to be, by analytical sophisms, dispossessed of unity, and cut and carved into essences, modes, relations, or somewhats, erecting a Deity of fractions, but annihilating that tremendous ubiquity which pervades, sustains, and animates unbounded creation.

But if to profess one thing and believe another, be inconsistent with rectitude and integrity, the Unitarian Christian cannot remain in fellowship with an Orthodox institution. If, as is often affirmed, disguised Unitarians do exist, and have existed in Trinitarian establishments, they cannot have imbibed the spirit of Christianity, but have merely adopted what are styled the Unitarian dogmas, as a system of philosophical truths. They cannot lay claim to a higher character than that of playing the hypocrite from interested motives, and making of religion a convenient cloak. But if they are to be found even in the semblance of religious teachers, they are guilty of a flagrant infraction of the tenor and spirit of Christ's instructions, if not violators of the most important Christian duties.

A Church establishment prescribes certain doctrines, which are to be believed and taught by those who receive of her emoluments. To receive the gratuity without performing the work, is evident dishonesty. But to be the advocate of dogmas which he is paid to support, but does not believe, is an equal sacrifice of moral honesty. If he does not support them, he is an unfaithful steward in the vineyard, and a false shepherd of the fold of which he professes to be a member. If, contrary to conviction, he publicly teaches those principles which he is paid for maintaining, he stands up as a religious teacher in any spirit but that of truth and sincerity. He assumes to be

a disciple and follower of the lowly Nazarene, and proclaims his own condemnation. He is conscious of circumlocution and tergiversation, of evasion and fraud, on the most awful and important subjects. Interest prompts him to conceal within his breast, what conscience whispers it is his bounden duty to publish. Can he declare what he believes to be the whole counsel of God? Dare he give a full explication, in truth and soberness, of the things which pertain to eternity? Can he fearlessly proclaim the gospel of Christ, and the way of salvation? Alas! no. Bound hand and foot, standing in a situation of awful responsibility, by teaching that which he knows to be false, as the truth of God and of his Christ, and refusing to bear that public testimony which our Lord and Master exacts from his true disciples, can he escape the maledictions to which such cowardly desertions from the path of duty are liable? Is not this to be ashamed of a crucified Christ, by being ashamed of avowing him in naked unvarnished simplicity; and, therefore, bowing the knee to him as a participator in the throne of Deity, and invested with the glories of Divinity? Is not this denying Christ, by denying in themselves the moral power of his precepts, the efficacy of his instructions, the influence of his example, to purify, and reform, and elevate, the character? To him, says the apostle, that knoweth to do good, and doeth it not, to him it is sin. ZACCHEUS.

Letters addressed to a small Unitarian Congregation, by their former Minister.

LETTER III.

(Concluded from page 311.)

ANOTHER obvious advantage arising from public worship, is, that by uniting together in one assembly, minds and hearts of a kindred nature, our common sympathies are thereby strengthened, virtuous friendships are formed, Christian intercourse is facilitated, and social happiness increased. Regard, then, public worship under this view, as the most efficient means of adding to the sum of human felicity. I know and regret, that those reciprocal feelings of Christian affection, which should be the chief characteristics of every Christian assembly, are not manifested in that degree, which every good man possessed of

the spirit of his Master, must desire. This, however, is to be attributed to the imperfection of our common nature. As the genius of Christianity becomes better understood, when it shall be embraced more from conviction and principle than from the slavish influence of custom and fashion, its purifying and ennobling energies will be more strikingly exhibited, public worship will be regarded as our most imperative duty and highest privilege, and the enemies of our faith will be compelled to exclaim, with an ancient heathen, "Behold how these Christians love one another." In the house of God—in that hallowed place where he lifts upon the devout mind the light of his countenance, and gives us pledges of his eternal love, the factitious distinctions of life should be forgotten, and the highest stand on common ground with the lowest; to offer common praises, and to supplicate common blessings at the footstool of him, who is alike the friend and Father of all. When the duties of public worship are performed under these views, how admirably calculated are its exercises, not only to tune the heart to devotion, but to inspire it also with the most disinterested and expansive benevolence. It is impossible for the man who feels his relation to God, as his Father, and contemplates heaven as the abode of the spirits of the just made perfect, to look around upon his fellow-worshippers, and behold them in any other light than his brethren, alike the children of the same heavenly Parent, and heirs together of that immortal inheritance, which shall suffer neither termination nor decay. Though it must be acknowledged, that public worship tends, in a very powerful degree, to excite the common sympathies of our nature, and to dispose us to be kindly affectioned one to another; yet, my friends, how little has it done, with what it is capable of doing! In but too many religious societies of every denomination, do we observe an indifference and coldness to the sublime and momentous concerns of religion, a deadness of heart, and the want of a mutual sympathy and co-operation one with another. I most sincerely hope that this is not your condition—a condition which tends to impair the energies of religion, and to banish it from the world. There are but few congregations, I should presume, but what require some improvement in these important respects, and I, for one, should rejoice to see the great and eternal principle of Christian equality less loudly professed, and more practi-

cally observed. "*One is your Master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren.*"

An objection, within these few years, has started up against the propriety and authority of public social worship, on the ground that it is not *commanded* in the New Testament. You must, my brethren, be familiar with some of the arguments by which this strange and novel opinion is maintained, from the circumstance of many of its advocates residing within your immediate neighbourhood. I am happy to know that you have not been induced to forsake the assembling of yourselves together, for the truly delightful, rational, and Christian purpose of "worshipping the Father in spirit and in truth." Though social worship—the mode and time of its celebration, whether we are to meet once or twice, or three times on a day for that purpose, be not expressly commanded or distinctly stated by Jesus or his apostles, yet it might be easily shown, that *Christianity recognises the principle* on which alone we rest the authority and value of social worship. This we deem sufficient. If the New Testament said not a word relative to social worship, the very fact of its containing a religion adapted to our moral state, as helpless, dependent, and social beings, would be a sufficient inducement and authority, to unite in acts of social devotion. Besides, to adopt the words of that eloquent and profound Divine, Dr. Channing: "we are not among those who consider the written word as a *statute-book*, by the letter of which every step in life must be governed. We believe, on the other hand, that one of the great excellences of Christianity, is, that it does not deal in minute regulation, but that, having given broad views of duty, and enjoined a pure and disinterested spirit, it leaves us to apply these rules, and express this spirit, according to the promptings of the divine monitor within us, and according to the claims and exigences of the ever-varying conditions in which we are placed. We believe, too, that revelation is not intended to supersede God's other modes of instruction; that it is not intended to drown, but to make more audible the voice of nature." In the sentiment of this extract, I perfectly concur. It contains a principle strictly philosophical and purely Christian. The religion of Jesus Christ is not a minute system of legislation; were it so, it would be unsuited to the condition of man, diversified as that condition is, by ten thousand dif-

ferent circumstances. Did Christianity descend to minute particulars, which it made essential to its nature and its power, this very circumstance would be an effectual barrier to its extensive conquests and universal triumphs. Regard, then, my friends, pure religion as containing a few great and all-comprehensive truths, which it leaves to the conscience of every individual to apply. Social worship is perfectly reconcileable with the spirit of the gospel. It derives its strength and energy in a superior manner from the Christian religion, which is peculiarly and essentially a social religion, adapted to man as an improveable and social being. And whatever may be said to the contrary, the teachings of the human heart—the voice of God speaking within us—the spirit of Christ animating our breasts with the love of our heavenly Father, and of each other—all conspire to impress on our minds an abiding sense of our mutual dependence and necessities, and to lead us to express in the social exercises of prayer, the wants and thanksgivings of our hearts.

Farther, a regular attendance on public worship, is necessary to the keeping alive of genuine devotional feelings in ourselves, and by the influence of our example, is productive of good to others. Wherever you find the public means of religion neglected, whether in a single family or a whole community, there you will generally discover a low standard of morality. In proportion as a people are influenced by the great principles of uncorrupted Christianity, are the character, peace, and happiness, of a nation increased and secured. This is equally true of a a family, or religious society, as of a whole country. Genuine religion contains that conciliatory, binding, and cementing principle, the exercise of which, is productive of "peace upon earth, and good-will towards men." Public worship I regard as an indispensable means by which religion is to be kept alive in the world, and made to have its proper influence on the public mind. It is a powerful instrument, constantly operating for the good of mankind. With the greatest earnestness, then, I entreat you you not to neglect it; allow no trivial circumstance to keep you from the house of prayer, for remember, that every unnecessary absence has inevitably such an influence upon the mind, as to create a distaste for the exercises of devotion. Make it, then, a matter of religious conscience, not to neglect, in a single instance, the duties

of the sanctuary, unless there be an imperious necessity. I know the common excuses, and that too well, from having heard them so often made. I fear there is a growing disinclination to public worship in the present day; particularly amongst those who would be thought more rational and genteel than the generality of mankind. To attend divine service in an afternoon,* is now, amongst a certain class of the disciples of Christ, grown obsolete, and in the present age of religious refinement, is considered somewhat vulgar. So that now, to use the expressive language of the late Rev. George Walker, "we have the God of the morning and the God of the afternoon—the God of the humbler walks and the God of the genteel." These things ought not to be; they are opposed to the genius and tendency of genuine, heartfelt religion.

I have already, my friends, extended this communication beyond the limits I intended, but I cannot conclude without very briefly adverting to one more topic; and I do this the more earnestly, from a belief that its importance is not generally and sufficiently felt and understood. What I allude to, is this: the necessity of *preparing the mind* for the profitable discharge of the duties of social worship; and to make a practice of being in the chapel, and of fixing the attention on those things which should alone engage it, *before* the service commences. The latter, I have often painfully observed, in some congregations, to be shamefully neglected. When the mind is not previously prepared by private meditation and prayer, how is it possible that we can worship Him acceptably, who is a spirit, "in spirit and in truth." Give, then, this subject your serious consideration; and resolve to be in readiness on every Sabbath, to enter with composure and delight, on its sacred and interesting duties. I scarcely need say, that the coming in after the services have begun, must tend to disconcert the mind of the minister, distract the attention of the congregation, and often to destroy that harmony of thought and feeling, on which the efficacy of devotion mainly depends. The opinion, which is more or less influential amongst the generality of Christians, that the sermon is the principal and most important part of our public religious services, appears to me unfounded and absurd. It is the least important part of the services. We assemble *to worship God*, as well as to hear the sen-

* In Scotland, the case is exactly reversed.—*Ed.*

timents of man. However valuable and important may be the latter, it can bear no comparison with the former. What we address to God, must be infinitely more important that what we hear from man. Think not, then, my brethren, that you have performed the greater duties of the sanctuary, if you manage to be in time for the sermon. This, I fear, is a delusion into which too many fall. But of you I hope better things, and it is my sincere prayer that as you form a part of the worshippers of God on earth, so likewise may you form a part of that great multitude which no man can number, that shall worship the Almighty for ever in heaven.

I remain, Christian Brethren, Yours,

March 6, 1829. G. B.

The Unitarian, No. 4.

(Concluded from page 287.)

Another text which has been triumphantly appealed to, as containing a full proof of the deity of Christ, and even of his being God and man at the same time. is Phil. ii. 6 to 11, "Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God; but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, &c." But if we attentively read the passage, we shall find, that even as it stands in the public version, it affords no foundation for any such opinion. Throughout the whole passage, Jesus Christ is as clearly and fully distinguished from God, as one being can well be distinguished from another; it is said, that he is "in the form of God," "equal to or like God," that "God hath highly exalted him, and *given* him a name which is above every name," and that his exaltation, and the submission and honour paid to him, are to the glory of God." He who is called God throughout the passage, is unquestionably the one supreme, self-existent, and eternal Jehovah; the person who was in his form, whom he had exalted, and who was honoured only to his glory, must be inferior to him, and Jesus Christ always so speaks of himself; his words are, "My Father is greater than I," "the works that I do are not mine, but the Father's who sent me," "I will pray unto my Father," &c. Besides, the Apostle is here recommending the disciples to humility, by the example of Christ, and surely his thinking it not robbery to be

equal with God, can be no proof of humility. The 6th and 7th verses, as they stand in the public version, appear to me to be in direct contradiction to each other: "he thought it not robbery to be equal with God; but," as a consequence of his so thinking, "made himself of no reputation," is not, I think, sense. Let us see whether all these difficulties may not be removed, by an impartial consideration of the text.

It is universally agreed by the best critics, that the word "form," means here only the outward form or appearance; and the words here translated "equal with God," only express similarity, not proper and full equality, and ought to be rendered "*as* God" or "*like* God." The word here translated "robbery," means a booty, a prey, the thing seized upon, or else the *act* of seizing and plundering; the majority of expositors (for their reasons, see Belsham, p. 136) prefer the former meaning, and this is the way in which it was evidently understood by the early Christian fathers, (See Belsham, p. 138, and Clarke, No. 934). It is with great diffidence that I reject here the interpretation of this text, given by all the most eminent Arian and Unitarian critics, (who think that the apostle refers to his miraculous powers, when he says that Jesus was in the form of God, and adopt that of Mr. Marsom, (See Christ. Refor. vol. ii. p. 457). The Apostle appears to him and to me, to refer to well-known occurrences in the history of our Lord, and the following appears to us to be the true interpretation of the text: "Let this mind be in you which was in Christ Jesus, who being in the form of God," at his transfiguration on the mount, when, as the Evangelist informs us (Luke ix. 29.) "the fashion," form or appearance "of his countenance, was altered, and his raiment was white and glistering, and his face did shine as the sun." Peter makes his transfiguration an evidence of Christianity, when he says: "For we have not followed cunningly-devised fables, when we made known unto you the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eye-witnesses of his majesty. For he received from God the Father, power and glory, when there came such a voice to him from the excellent glory, This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased. And this voice which came from heaven, we heard when we were with him in the holy mount," (2 Peter, i. 16 to 18). John, who also was with him in the mount, alludes, I con-

ceive, to this circumstance, when he says (John i. 15), "We beheld his glory," and as this was the only instance in which, in the presence of his disciples, he was announced by a voice from heaven, as the "beloved Son" of God, he describes that glory as "the glory of the only begotten of the Father." This is what I conceive the Apostle meant, by saying that Jesus was in "the form of God;" Peter, indeed, thought it would have been good for him to have retained that divine form; but the meek and lowly Jesus thought otherwise, he "did not esteem this likeness to God as a prey," as a thing to be eagerly grasped at or ambitiously retained, "but made himself of no reputation," or as the word would be more liberally rendered, "he divested himself of it, and took upon him the form of a servant." Jesus assumed the form of a servant when, at his last supper, he girded himself with a towel, and washed the feet of his disciples, to which, I conceive, the Apostle here alludes; he assumed the *form* only, and was not, in reality, their servant, and he tells them, that he performed it expressly with a view of setting them an example of humility, "If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet, ye also ought to wash one another's feet," (John xiii. 14); and humility is the very virtue which the apostle is here recommending by the example of Christ. "And was made" or was "in the likeness of man," *i. e.* of another man, (See Judges xvi. 11, 17, where the same Greek word is used), "and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself," still farther, "and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross; wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name that at" or in "the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." God hath for his humility and obedience even unto death, exalted him to the reality of that glory of which he had only the form or appearance in his transfiguration on earth, and so shall we be exalted, if we attend to the Apostle's exhortation, and imitate closely this example of humility and obedience. Thus, this disputed and somewhat obscure text will, if it be so understood, form another beautiful illustration of the Scripture doctrine of the inferiority and submission of Christ to his God and Father. Γαμμα.

Funeral Sermons.

Mr. Editor,

The following anecdote is extracted from an interesting work lately published, entitled, "A Personal Narrative of a Journey through Norway, &c. by Derwent Conway." The story may, perhaps, prove interesting to some of your readers, and serve to diversify the serious yet befitting tone of your work.—Yours, G. C. S.

"I remained in the house of the minister about two hours, almost the whole of which time he entertained me with a detail of his grievances, consisting of scanty remunerations, poor fees, and the disuse of funeral sermons, which, he said, were now scarcely ever required; and without any expression of disapprobation, he related a stratagem devised by a brother minister, who held a cure on the west coast, by which he had succeeded in restoring, in some measure, the usage of funeral sermons—a service for which it seems the minister is generally well paid. This minister having got a number of crabs, and having contrived to fix small candles on their backs, put them one dark night into the church-yard, where they wandered about, crawling over the graves, and beneath the tombstones. He then called together a number of his superstitious parishioners, and pointing to the appalling spectacle, told them these were the souls of the dead, who could not rest in their graves until those services should be performed, that had been neglected at the time of their burial. The anecdote may be true or false; but such a story could never have been invented, if there were not ministers wicked enough so to deceive the people, and people sufficiently superstitious to be so deceived. On these grounds the story is worth recording."

To the Editor of the Christian Pioneer.

Sir,

I beg leave to supply an omission in the 4th No. of the *Unitarian*. Your Correspondent enumerates three interpretations of the introduction to John, but overlooks the Arian, which I conceive to be embarrassed with fewer difficulties than any of the others. It is, in fact, attended only with two. The first is to prove, that the Word is an appellation of the Messiah; and the second, that the term God may be applied to Beings in-

ferior to the Almighty. That the WORD is here synonymous with the Messiah, is the opinion of all Trinitarians, and, as your Correspondent observes, "of the Polish Socinians, Hopton Haynes, the friend of Sir Isaac Newton, the late excellent Mr. Cappe, Mr. Belsham, Mr. Simpson, Dr. Carpenter, and the Editors of the Improved Version." He might have added, of Primate Newcome, Dr. Price, Dr. Samuel Clarke, and many other great names. I might, therefore, dispense with proving this point, were it not questioned by some very eminent Humanitarian Divines. That, in Scriptural language, GOD is attributed as a title to supernatural beings, and even to *men* of superior dignity, knowledge, or power, is also admitted by all who have paid any attention to the subject. The only question is, Whether it be so applied in this passage? For the information of those who may not have turned their thoughts to it, I shall point out the texts by which these two positions are supported.

I. That the Messiah is sometimes denominated the WORD, is countenanced by the following texts, though not all of equal weight:—

Luke i. 2, "Eye witnesses and ministers of the WORD;" that is, those who were first the associates of Jesus, and spectators of his miracles, and afterwards his ministers. If the *Gospel* were intended, Luke would have said, "hearers," not eye witnesses.

John i. 1. "*In the beginning* was the WORD, and the WORD was with God, and the WORD was God; the same was *in the beginning* with God:" "and (14) the WORD was made flesh, and dwelt among us." I do not think that any criticism can divest this description of personality.

2 Peter iii. 5, "By the WORD of God the heavens were of old: (7) and by the same WORD are kept in store." More ambiguous than the former.

1 John i. 1, "That which was *from the beginning*, which we have heard, which we have seen, * * * and our hands have handled, of the *Word of life;* (for the *life* was made manifest, and we have seen it: and bear witness, and show unto you that eternal *life* which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us;) that which we have seen and heard, declare we unto you."

I omit 1 John v. 7, as spurious. It only shows, that the interpolator understood the Apostle as appropriating the WORD to Christ.

Revelation xix. 13, "He was clothed with a vesture dipped in blood: and his name is called, THE WORD OF GOD; (15) and out of his mouth came a sharp sword." For the meaning of this last phrase, see Heb. iv. 12, "The word of God is sharper than any two-edged sword;" and for, "rule with a rod of iron," and "tread the wine press," see parallel passages in Isaiah, xi. 4, lxiii. 3, which are usually thought to refer to Christ.

You will observe, that three of these quotations are from the same author, who would probably use the phrase always in the same sense. It is also remarkable, that other important words occur more than once: *viz.* "in the beginning," three times, very emphatically, in John i. 1 and 2; "life," twice in John i. 3, and twice in 1 John i. 2; all indicating, that the writer had the same subject in his view in all these passages.

II. Of the application of GOD to inferior beings, the examples are many and various. In this use of the word, the only attributes implied, are authority and dignity. It may, therefore, be predicated of any persons possessed of these qualities. A few instances will suffice. Gen. iii. 5, "Ye shall be as GODS, knowing good and evil." Exodus vii. 1, "I have made thee a GOD unto Pharaoh; and Aaron, thy brother, shall be thy prophet," (iv. 16) and "thou shalt be to him instead of GOD." 1 Sam. xxviii. 13, it is applied to the spectres that appeared to Saul. Idols are every where styled gods, even by St. Paul, 1 Cor. viii, 5; and Jehovah is frequently called GOD of gods. This title is often given to princes, judges, and prophets, according to that saying of our Lord, John x. 34, "Is it not written in your law, I said, Ye are *gods;*" calling "them GODS to whom the Word of God came." The only question is, Whether the last word in the first verse of John, is to be understood in this enlarged sense? That it is, may be inferred from two circumstances: 1st, That otherwise the proposition is identical and unmeaning, or would imply, that there are two Supreme Gods. 2d, That in the Greek, the second word, signifying God, is distinguished from the first by the want of the article, which leaves it indefinite. It may be translated *a God.*

Now, these two points being conceded, the whole passage will run smoothly, agreeably to the authorised version, thus:

"In the beginning was the Messiah, and the Messiah

was with God; and the Messiah was a divine being [or godlike person]. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him;" and so on, according to Col. i. 16; Heb. i. 2; and Eph. iii. 9. Again, at the 14th verse, "The Messiah was made flesh, and dwelt among us, full of grace and truth; and we *beheld* his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father."

Having thus supplied the deficiency in the *Unitarian's* enumeration, and explained the Arian scheme of interpretation, I have no more to add, as I have no intention to enter into controversy. ERASMUS.

Reflections on the Principles & Evidences of Christianity.

LETTER VII.

Of the Evidence presented to the Apostles, of the Resurrection of Jesus to Immortality.

THE extraordinary occurrences relative to the resurrection of Jesus, which transpired between that event and his manifestations to his Apostles, appear to have been in a great degree intended to act as preparatives upon their minds. The women were specially commissioned to deliver messages to them from the angels, and from Jesus himself; and the two disciples appeared to feel, that they were under an obligation to make an immediate communication of what they had witnessed to the apostles. They were the accredited organs through whom the knowledge of this great fact was to be announced to the world at large; and it was therefore requisite that their minds should be duly prepared for its reception, by statements calculated to awaken their interest and excite their inquiries, but without creating any credulous anticipations of his appearance; as well as that it should eventually be brought home to their convictions by every variety of evidence. The messages by the women corresponded with the former of these objects, and with the effects they actually produced; they simply acquainted them with his removal to a superior state, and confined their prospects of meeting him, to a particular spot in Galilee; so that they were not calculated to beget any expectations of meeting him at Jerusalem.

Before the arrival of the two disciples with their intelligence, however, the Apostles had learned, that "the Lord was risen, indeed, and had appeared unto Simon;" or, according to the rendering of Wakefield, "had been seen by Simon;" which is also mentioned, 1 Cor. xv. 5. This interview being confirmed by the narration of the two disciples up to the time of his becoming known to them, had the effect of producing a general conviction in the company, that Jesus was alive and not far off, and, consequently, they might now, very naturally expect his arrival among them. Nor, after the kind messages they had received from him, of the reality of which they could now entertain little doubt, is it conceivable that they could be greatly alarmed at his presence, much less be terrified at the apprehension, that a departed spirit was presented to them in his living person. He was now, however, seen standing "in the midst of them," and though he addressed them in the language of peace, they "were terrified and affrighted, and supposed that they had seen a spirit," (See Luke xxiv. 35, 37). The reason of their being thus affected, appears from the connection: the two disciples were speaking of him as an absent person, and before they have concluded their speech, he is presented in the very midst of them, in a manner which exactly corresponded with their ideas of a disembodied spirit or apparition. The apostle John, in making mention of the same meeting, says, it was "when the doors were shut for fear of the Jews;" which seems to imply, that they were fastened in a way which precluded access from without, unless by some extraordinary means; and the signification of the Greek κλειω, according to the rendering of Dr. Jones, in his Lexicon, is, not simply to *shut* or *close*, but to *bar up, fasten;* the "*shutting up of heaven three years and six months,*" Luke iv. 25, and of compassion from a brother in need, 1 John, iii. 17, are appropriate instances of the force of the term. That Jesus entered without the doors being opened, was evidently the conclusion of the company, who would have been affected by fears of a very different description, had they observed those doors to be forcibly opened, which had been firmly closed for the purpose of precluding their mortal enemies; nor could this have been effected upon folding doors secured for such a purpose, without its attracting their marked attention. Had Jesus entered by them in a man-

ner which was open to their observation, it might, in the first instance, have alarmed them, but it could have excited no apprehensions that he was a mere intangible shade or spirit, agreeably to the received notions; and that he should have opened and closed them by some miraculous means, unperceived by them, is a mere arbitrary supposition, contrary to the statement of the Evangelists. Besides, what end would be answered by such a miracle, but that of deceiving the disciples, by leading them to suppose that he had been previously invisible, when, in reality, he had entered with the precisely same animal frame which he afterwards presented to them. Whereas, admitting their observations to have been correct, that "when the doors were closed," he, from previous invisibility, was found "standing in the midst of them," it exactly corresponds with his having "become invisible" to the two disciples, and having entered into that state from the period of his resurrection, only occasionally manifesting himself at particular junctures; and, with the like occasional appearances of the heavenly messengers, the whole concurs in evincing, that he was both raised from death, and translated to a celestial existence.

That, previous to his manifestation in this instance, he was invisibly present, is further shown, by his appearing at the critical moment when the two disciples had said that he had been made known to them, and before they had mentioned his having become invisible. At this juncture, the Apostles having been fully assured by the joint testimony of Peter and the two disciples, that Jesus was risen and alive, and having received no intimations of his translation to invisibility, could have no conception of such an event; nor could any occurrence be more unexpected, or appear more incredible to them, than the existence of a living man in such a state. His manifestation from invisibility at this moment, therefore, could be no figment of any one of their imaginations, much less of those of a whole company, whose thoughts must now have been wholly absorbed with the pleasing anticipation of meeting their Master on the terms of ordinary humanity. But had Jesus waited till the two disciples had concluded their narration, with the statement, that he had no sooner been recognized by them than he became invisible; and had he *then*, or soon after, presented himself in the corresponding manner, it would certainly have found them

much more prepared to anticipate such a mode of appearance, and we could, with less confidence, have concluded that their imaginations had not given a colouring to their testimony as it regards this circumstance. But from their extreme surprise and affright, and their supposing that they beheld a departed spirit in the person of him of whose restoration to life they were fully assured, it is evident, that they had no conception, and, consequently, could have received no information concerning his existence in an invisible state. Our Lord, therefore, chose the very moment when the two disciples had delivered that part of their narrative which announced his becoming known to them, and had proceeded no farther, to present himself to the company. He must, therefore, have been present, and intimately acquainted with what was passing among them, and even with the precise state of their minds at that instant, thus to have seized it for the purpose of manifesting himself to their view. Consequently, he was previously invisible, and, in all probability, had remained in that state, with a perfect cognizance of every occurrence relating to the proceedings of his disciples from the time of his disappearance from the two brethren, to that of his manifestation on this occasion.

Still, it may be thought, that the evidences which Jesus proceeded to give of his bodily presence, are inconsistent with his previous invisibility, and were exhibited for the express purpose of proving the contrary. But, surely, his object in this, as in every other measure relative to his resurrection, was not simply to prove that he was returned to the state of mortality, but to bring home the reality of his revival, and of the great and glorious change with which it was attended, to the knowledge and conviction of these witnesses. Though the observations of the Apostles, with regard to the mode of his appearance, were correct, yet their inference from it was utterly erroneous, *viz.* that he remained in the state of death, instead of being actually restored to life, and elevated to higher vitality. Had this error been suffered to continue, it would have proved fatal to the doctrine of a *resurrection* to a state of immortality, since this state would still have been considered as the consequence of dissolution. Now, the doctrine of the separate existence of spirits, is founded on circumstances, both as it respects the minds of the observers, and the objects contemplated; the very reverse of

those which we have now to consider. Tales of apparitions are always under circumstances in which the imagination, not only *might be*, but, in all probability, *was* the cause of all the phenomena. The objects presented, are merely objects of sight, and elude the touch, because the notices of this sense are of too palpable a nature, to be confounded with the operations of the fancy. It admits not of a rational conjecture, that the figure of a murdered or injured person, presenting itself to the troubled imagination in silence and darkness, when it is most vivid and uninterrupted in its operations, can be no other than an object of its own creation, and not an external reality—a real vestige of the living man, assuming, after death, his shadowy form and appearance. The facts, in such cases, are easily resolved into the internal processes of the mind, without having recourse to so incredible a supposition, as that a man's shadowy form remains in a state of animation after the body is committed to the grave. But in the present case, every thing is the reverse: though the body of Jesus had been dead and entombed, it had disappeared from its sepulchre; and such evidences, from various sources, had previously been brought to the knowledge of minds in a state of extreme incredulity, as had at length overcome their disbelief, and given them the fullest confidence in its reality. They were assembled in a company, comprising, probably, many other persons, besides the greater part of the Apostles; and all the faculties of their minds must, at this moment, have been occupied with the assurance, which they had just heard confirmed, of the revival of their venerated Master. Their imaginations had, at this moment, no room for the conception of his disembodied spirit, which, had it crossed the minds of any of them, must have been instantly rejected, as utterly inconsistent with the joyful conviction which now absorbed their attention. Nevertheless, the extraordinary mode of his appearance had reversed the whole frame of their conceptions, and made them suppose, that the man who had been so satisfactorily proved to be alive, was dead, and that his troubled spirit now accosted them. As such a sudden revolution, in so many minds at once, could only have been produced by the force of external reality, so the opposite change which was now effected, could result only from realities of an opposite description.

Apparitions leave their credulous votaries in the same

state of excitement and want of solid evidence, in which they are raised; they cannot endure the steady observation even of the awakened sight; they vanish from the touch, and from the light of day, and the sober gaze of reason. Jesus, on the contrary, proceeded immediately to calm the troubled apprehension—to recal the wandering intellect and senses to their cool, deliberate exercise. He presents himself both to the sight and the touch of a whole company of men, who, without much exercise of both these senses, could scarcely be brought to credit their report. In order, therefore, for their further conviction, he eats and drinks before them, of their own provisions, of the solid reality of which they could have no doubt; and, consequently, if before and after this manifestation, *he* was invisible, that must become the same, and, consequently, these were not imaginary, but real transmutations. Having thus calmed their minds, and convinced them of his bodily presence, he leads them back to his former intercourse with them, showing the accordance of his predictions with what they now witnessed, and with the ancient prophecies concerning the Messiah. And as he now opened their understandings to the true interpretation of those Scriptures, there can be little doubt, that he explained their application to that incorruptible state into which he had passed, and from which he now emerged, for the purpose of making the whole fully known to them: since, in their subsequent preaching, they fully manifested their conviction, as predicted by David, that he was raised from death, now "no more to see corruption," Acts ii. 31; xiii. 34, 35. By the discourse he now held with persons so perfectly acquainted with his former life, conversation, and manners, he must have fully manifested to them the identity of his *mind and character;* and in short, must have proved, that, notwithstanding the glorious change which had taken place in him, and which raised him above the precarious state of mortality, he was the same Jesus who now was bringing to a consummation, the great and glorious objects of his mission. HOMO.

Dialogues on Religion.—No. 4.

A. You are welcome home. I was inquiring for you, and heard you were gone on your travels.

T. I was prevailed on by a friend to accompany him on a trip to Edinburgh.

A. Well, I suppose you heard their most celebrated preachers. How do you like them?

T. I was only one Sunday in the city, and was on my way to Greyfriars, when my ears caught the notes of an organ.

A. Ah! some English or Romish chapel, I suppose.

T. No, indeed: a Presbyterian church.

A. Not of the Establishment, I am sure: for that fancy was set at rest, long ago; first at Aberdeen, and then at Glasgow.

T. You might well suppose, it was not an Established Kirk; for like all other Establishments, they are obstinately determined against improvement. When the people disfigured the churches, and tore down the images and pictures, and the nobility seized on the church lands, the clergy reserved to themselves a portion of infallibility and church power. The organ that attracted me, was lately erected in a Kirk of Relief.

A. Why, this is, if possible, still more strange. Alas! for the descendants of the sturdy Cameronians! I never suspected them of leading the way in such an innovation.

T. To be sure, every improvement is an innovation. All things were once new. The exclusion of instrumental music from the Reformed Churches, was an innovation. The Reformation itself was a glorious innovation. I have often wondered at the barbarous prejudice of Presbyterians and some other sectaries, against this innocent and elegant help to our devotional feelings. Notwithstanding my partiality to their simple forms, and their orthodox doctrine, I feel an almost insuperable repugnance to listen to their dull, discordant, groaning psalmody, conducted by a snuffling clerk, giving out line by line. As to joining in it, that is totally out of my power. I am deafened by the stunning roar of a multitude of untaught peasants or tradespeople; and the song of some snivelling precentor, with two or three squeaking children, and a few discordant voices through the house, is still less tolerable. It is neither music nor worship.

A. You may have had reason for your disgust; and I believe you may extend your censure, with few exceptions, to all the country churches in England and Ireland. I know you are somewhat of an amateur; and I suspect, that,

with others of that class, you attend more to the concord of voices, than to the melody of the heart. I think you would sympathise with the Italian musician, who, as he was passing one of those Scotch Kirks during the psalm, exclaimed, "If these good people must go to heaven, I hope they will not be allowed to sing there." It is an old saying, that every one is pleased with his own song. *Nemini injucundum quod cantat ipse.* Your man, with the great bellows and his hundred pipes, however, would soon remedy that, and drown all their concords and discords together, and then with a voluntary, send them off, as the poet has it, "with a jig to heaven."

T. This cannot be the case, when he is under proper direction, or where there is a sufficient choir; for the organ should only accompany the voices, give them strength, body, and union, and regulate the time and melody. Perhaps, it should hardly be heard distinctly above the choir or congregation.

A. This is a vain expectation; for when an organ is admitted, the taste of the performer or the audience is continually suggesting something new, till the people are silenced, and worship by the proxy of a choir. Even anthems and songs from Oratorios, are not sufficient to display the powers of the instrument, or the execution of the artist; and then preludes, symphonies, voluntaries, and I know not what, must be called in. These are the pieces in which musical proficients delight, for whose entertainment, indeed, they are provided, and who soon grow weary of metrical psalmody. But is it not manifest, that these can make no part of religious worship? Are they not in direct opposition to the Apostle's injunction, that "all things be done to edifying?" Are they not obnoxious to his condemnation, of speaking in an unknown tongue, and every other practice that conveys no meaning to the congregation. "Things," says he, "without life, giving sound, whether pipe or harp, except they give a distinction in the sound," or are accompanied "by audible and intelligible words," how shall it be known what is piped or harped?

T. True. But we persuade ourselves, and feel, that even these inarticulate sounds do convey, if not words, something better—devout sentiments and emotions, which could not be excited by articulate psalmody.

A. In this, however, there is reason to fear, that you

deceive yourselves, and that they produce no effect beyond the gratification of the ear; for the most impious and dissolute blasphemer will derive, from the same performance, the very same kind of pleasure, and often in a much more exquisite degree. Besides, refined music tends to bring both preaching and prayer into neglect. When Christians desert plain psalmody, they cannot tell where they will stop; for they will gradually wander into that theatrical service, which is so much disapproved of by many, who are obliged to join in it.

T. Though I delight in the richness and variety of a grand organ, I confess that it does not harmonize altogether with the simplicity of Christian worship. It is rather calculated to produce grand emotions, of which the multitude are incapable. Those who are, it elevates "above this visible diurnal sphere." To describe its influence on myself, I am inclined to adopt the words of St. Paul, "Whether in the body or out of the body, I know not; but I seem to be caught up into Paradise, and to hear unspeakable sounds," or those of Pope:

> "While the full organ joins the tuneful quire,
> The immortal powers incline their ear:
> Borne on the swelling notes our souls aspire,
> While solemn airs improve the sacred fire."

A. Very bad. I am sure, he was not inspired, when he hammered out these miserable rhymes. I am glad, however, that you have conceded so much to us, who cannot boast of such seraphic feelings. For my own part, I never wish for more than two leading voices, sweet and strong; one pitched an octave above the other, that the men and women may each have a guide in unison with themselves. Counterpoint and tunes that require execution, are entirely misplaced in an ordinary place of worship. Keep them and organs, for Oratorios. But then I would have psalmody made a regular part of education. The ancient Church was content with the plain chant. It was long before the Pope admitted an organ into his private chapel; and Pius VI. ordered it to be discontinued. Even the *Miserere* has no instrumental accompaniment.

Notwithstanding your contempt for Presbyterian psalmody, the singing in many Dissenting congregations, may gratify the most fastidious ears; and, to my taste, the unison of a numerous body of people, strong enough to overpower individual discords, is the most sublime expression of devotion. Besides, the rustic psalmody of a

country congregation should hardly be considered as music, or subjected to the laws of harmony. It is a kind of recitative, in which all, old and young, male and female, may bear a part. It is a speaking music scarcely amounting to singing, but yet different from speech. It may probably partake of the character of the old Ambrosian or Gregorian chant, or plain song. It is necessary that the people should take a part in public worship. In the Romish and English churches, their attention is kept up by change of posture; in the Scotch, by joining in the psalm.

T. I can only say, that you have been more fortunate than I, if you have met with good music in congregational psalmody; but you know, *de gustibus non est disputandum.* I feel great confidence, however, in my own taste, when I find it sanctioned by the austere and sublime Milton:

"There let the pealing organ blow
To the full-voiced choir below,
In service high and anthems clear,
As may, with sweetness, through mine ear
Dissolve me into ecstacies,
And bring all heaven before mine eyes."

A. His austerity seems to have yielded to his sublimity in this instance; yet, though it may appear preposterous and even ludicrous to say it, there is, to my mind, more real sublimity in the simple psalm of the persecuted Covenanters:

"When, leaning on his spear,
The liart veteran heard the Word of God
By Cameron thunder'd, or by Renwick pour'd
In gentle stream. Then rose the song, the loud
Acclaim of praise. The wheeling plover ceased
Her plaint; the solitary place was glad;
And on the distant cairns, the watchman's ear
Caught doubtfully, at times, the breeze-borne note."

T. I admit that the scene and the description are sublime; but rude and savage, and not to be compared with Milton's beautiful picture:

"But let my due feet never fail
To walk the studious cloister's pale,
And love the high embowed roof,
With antique pillars, massy proof,
And storied windows richly dight,
Casting a dim, religious light."

A. All mere theatrical frippery, in comparison; who would compare the gilded organ, the vicar's choral and singing boys, with their surplices and music-books, to the

loud acclaim of praise from three thousand zealous, persecuted Christians, on a wild and rugged mountain; or "the verger tripping before the Dean," with the plover soaring and wheeling above *their* heads, catching the sound as it rose mid-way on its ascent to heaven. Instead of the "liart veteran, leaning on his spear," with his cap of steel, you have the beadle with his staff and gold-laced hat; and what have you in lieu of the "watchman," stationed on a height, to give warning of the approach of Claverhouse's and Dalzell's hell-hounds, thirsting for their blood, while they

> "Dauntlessly would meet, in some lone dell,
> By rocks o'er-canopied, to hear the voice,
> Their faithful shepherd's voice. He, by the gleam
> Of sheeted lightning, ope'd the sacred Book,
> And words of comfort spake."

T. Where did you find these fine lines?

A. In Grahame's Sabbath, where you may see more in the same strain. The finest performers in the world, could never produce such a sublime and pathetic effect as the six thousand children who annually assemble in St. Paul's.

Here are a few lines of a different stamp, containing more truth than poetry.

> "In times of old, when God was to be praised,
> Our humble ancestors their *voices* raised;
> And hymns of thanks from grateful bosoms flow'd,
> For ills prevented or for good bestow'd;
> But as the church increased in power and pride,
> The pomp of sound the want of sense supplied;
> Then were majestic *organs* taught to blow,
> And plain religion grew a *raree-show.*"

(To be Concluded in our next.)

REVIEW.

"*The Library of Entertaining Knowledge,*" Vol. I. Part I.

GREAT are the exertions which are now making for the enlightenment of the people, arising, in no inconsiderable degree, from the influence and example of that eloquent orator and profound scholar, Mr. Brougham. For years, indeed, exertions have been making; but they were not of the right sort—good as far as they went, they stopped short at a point when they were about to have an influence of inestimable value. It is not merely the ability to

read and write, that the people want. Such qualifications, it is true, cannot fail to elevate the character; and may, under favourable circumstances, lead to the most desirable results. But if they are to derive from education its proper advantages, they must be led beyond the mere portal of the temple of knowledge. They must be introduced to an acquaintance with those branches of education which teach men their duties, disclose to them the wonders of their Creator's works, and make them acquainted with their own faculties and destiny. Up to the present day, however, little has been done to secure to the poor the blessings which must accrue from knowledge of this description. The favourable circumstances of which we have before spoken, did not exist; and the people could advance but little beyond the merest elements of information. The directors of the enlightenment of the mass of society, seem to have set too great a value on the mechanical attainments of reading and writing. They are useful and necessary, we grant; but little can they contribute towards the cultivation of the mind, for they consist in learning either to recognize or to trace the forms of letters, that is, the representatives of sounds. But many have felt a disinclination to the communication of any thing beyond the most trifling information to the people, from selfish considerations—apprehending, that the security with which they hold their stations might be endangered, if the means of a fair and equal competition were put in the hands of the working classes. Others, too, would have the people taught nothing but the Bible. What a manifest absurdity! Nothing could be more injurious to the sacred cause of religion. It *was* an absurdity, because it could not be realized; for when once you have begun to educate the people, you must go on. The only way to prevent their knowing this or that, is never to begin to instruct them. It *was* an absurdity, because it implied that the Bible was in danger from the spread of knowledge. For ourselves, we hold no compromise with error: we say, if it is in danger, let it meet and encounter the danger; if false, the sooner we are rid of it the better; if true, increase of knowledge will illustrate its excellence, and establish its claims. Unfortunately, however, a prejudice has been created against it in the minds of many, by the very measures which were taken for its support. Men have reasoned, and with a show of propriety, that a

book could not be of divine origin, which could obtain prevalence only in the exclusion of enlightenment, or, at least, that there must be something wrong in a system which requires for its maintenance, the degradation of the great bulk of the nation, at the very time when it was defended and upheld by all the splendours and emoluments of a hierarchy, the countenance and patronage of government, and learning the most varied and profound. The day of silly fears, is, we hope, hastening away. From the spread of knowledge, and the scrutiny of investigation, Christianity, it is our firm belief, has nothing to *apprehend*. Well may she say, "Save me from my friends, and I will protect myself from my enemies:" her worst enemies have been those of her own household. For her defence, she requires but an open field and fair play, adopting the words of Ajax, Ποιησον δ' αιθρην, δος δ' οφθαλμοισιν ιδεσθαι. If in these circumstances she fails, she ought to fail; for a bad cause only could meet with discomfiture. But true religion, wherever it be found, can be in no danger from a knowledge of the Creator—of his works—of man—of his capacities, duties, and expectations; for to know these things, is to know the will of God, and the way to serve him, and with such knowledge, every revelation, if true, must be in harmony. A little knowledge, it is true, may be injurious to truth; but in those cases only where the tongue outruns the judgment, and the decisions of the mind are too rapid to wait for thorough enlightenment.

The work whose title we have placed at the head of these remarks, proceeds from a Society to whom the people are deeply indebted. "The Society for the diffusion of useful knowledge," has already done much to relieve the Christian religion from the burden under which its injudicious friends had placed it. Great, almost beyond measure, would be the praise due to them, had they only effected the reformation of almanacks, by the publication of "the British Almanack," in which useful and valuable information takes the place of the absurdities which formed the chief part of all almanacks, and which still form the chief part of more than one—absurdities which tended to demoralize the people, and to rivet the bonds of superstition. But the Society has also published a series of essays on the various sciences, on history, and on biography. They are, indeed, yet incomplete; and they are also of unequal merit. The pieces of a scientific character are not, we

think, suited to the class of readers for whom they were intended; they want simplicity of language, felicity of illustration, and are altogether too technical, not to say abstruse, to be generally useful to those who, without much preparation, are beginning to master the elements of science. But we are enabled to speak in terms of unqualified praise, of the historical and biographical essays, which, for excellence of matter and manner, and for cheapness in price, (in which, beyond all comparison, they excel every modern production in this kingdom, and a most important feature is this in works designed for the people,) we recommend to our readers, assured, that they will bless the day when they first began to cultivate an acquaintance with productions so beneficial in their tendency. In respect of matter and execution, as well as of cheapness, the library of entertaining knowledge bids fair to surpass its elder brother. Of the last particular mentioned, our readers may judge from the fact, that the first number, price 2*s.* contains above two hundred pages closely printed, on good paper, and with a good type, illustrated by more than 40 wood cuts, taken from living animals, and well executed. As to the matter, we have to remark, that no science, not even history itself, contained, as set forth in popular works, more apocryphal matter than Zoology. Unauthenticated tales have been allowed to remain in circulation; false notions of the qualities and dispositions of animals, have prevailed to a degree credible only to those who have attended somewhat carefully to the subject. In the work now before us, however, we have a complete reformation. Vulgar errors are corrected; nothing but what is known on good authority, is set forth. In the menagerie of the library of entertaining knowledge, you see animals as they are, not as imagination and fear have represented them.

We have also been particularly pleased, that the thoughts of the reader are frequently directed from the works of the Creator, to the Creator himself, thus associating and blending in the youthful mind, the idea of God—his wisdom and his goodness, with its earliest acquisitions. Some instances occur, in which the writer takes occasion to illustrate the Scriptures; and with a few of these, the readers of the *Christian* Pioneer may not be displeased. In the first place, we have ourselves an application to make of a fact stated in the work. The prophet Isaiah uses the following language: "The wolf also shall dwell with the lamb; and

the leopard shall lie down with the kid; and the calf, and the young lion, and the fatling together; and a little child shall lead them." Many may have thought that the literal realization of what the prophet here predicts, was, in the nature of things, impossible; but the interesting extract we are about to make, will show to what an extent animals of the most hostile dispositions, may, by the force of education, be brought to live together in harmony. Hence, we may draw a hope, that the time will come, when Calvinists even and Unitarians, shall live together in peace, and Dr. Wardlaw himself regret to have penned the ill-mannered and bad-tempered paragraph, in which he took leave of the readers of the Christian Pioneer. In London may be daily seen, a cage about five feet square, containing quadrupeds and birds of the most opposite natures. "The keeper of this collection, John Austin, states, that he has employed 17 years in this business of training creatures of opposite natures, to live together in content and affection; and those years have not been unprofitably employed. It is not too much to believe, that many a person who has given his halfpenny to look upon this show, may have had his mind awakened to the extraordinary effects of habit and discipline, when he has thus seen the *cat, the rat, the mouse, the hawk, the rabbit, the guinea pig, the owl, the pigeon, the starling, and the sparrow*, each enjoying its respective modes of life in the company of the others: the weak without fear, the strong without the desire to injure." At page 44, the writer, after remarking that during winter, the dogs of the Esquimaux are treated with great severity and almost starved, adds, "The princes of the Trojan war, allowed their dogs to wait under their tables, to gather up the remains of their feasts. In the 23d book of the Iliad, it is mentioned, that Patroclus had no fewer than nine such humble retainers. The same princes, too, as we learn in the 10th book of the Odyssey, carried home to their dogs the fragments which fell from the tables of their entertainers. In allusion, probably, to this custom, the woman of Canaan says, 'The dogs eat of the crumbs which fall from their master's table.'" "The Esquimaux dogs do not bark, and this is a peculiarity of many varieties of the dog. Probably this is an effect of high as well as low temperature, for it rarely obtains in temperate countries." The prophet Isaiah alludes to this peculiarity, in his denunciation of idle instructors, 'They are dumb dogs,

and cannot bark.'" "From the earliest times, the dogs of the East, appear to have been without masters. The following passage in the 59th Psalm, evidently refers to this custom, 'At evening let them return, and let them make a noise like a dog, and go round about the city. Let them wander up and down for meat, and grudge if they be not satisfied.'" This passage is explained by Homer, by a reference to the fact just mentioned.

"The fox has been a destroyer of vineyards, from the earliest times." Thus, in Solomon's Song, "Take in the foxes, the little foxes that spoil the vines;" and thus also is seen the propriety of the good old fable of the fox and the grapes. We conclude our notice of this valuable little work, a work equally suited to the young of *all* classes, by the following quotation:—"The study of comparative anatomy, from which science we have collected this account of some of the peculiarities of the structure of the lion, constantly presents objects of interest. Galen, when studying human anatomy, was so struck with the perfection with which all the parts of the human arm and hand are adapted to one another, that he composed a hymn to the Deity, expressing his admiration of a piece of so much excellence. The more we extend our researches into the animal kingdom, the more shall we be struck with this extraordinary adaptation of the parts of living bodies to their respective uses—the more shall we be convinced, by our own imperfect knowledge, of the perfection of that Wisdom and Power, whose works are as marvellous as they are unbounded." G. C. S.

The Character and Writings of Fenelon.

[HAVING just received from Dr. Channing, the following admirable remarks (reprinted from the Christian Examiner) suggested by "Selections from the Writings of Fenelon," published in Boston, by "A Lady," we this month extend the number of our pages, in order to give a portion of this interesting article.—*Edit.*]

An attractive and quickening work on practical religion, we regard as a valuable accession to our literature. Indeed, any thing written with power on Christian morals and theology, is most welcome. It is too true, and a sad truth, that religious books are pre-eminently dull. If we wished to impoverish a man's intellect,

we could devise few means more effectual, than to confine him to what is called a course of theological reading. The very subject to which, above all others, the writer should bring his whole strength of thought and feeling, which allies itself to our noblest faculties—to which reason, imagination, taste, and genius, should bring their richest tribute, and consecrate their noblest efforts, is, of all subjects, treated most weakly, tamely, and with least attractions. Of course, there are splendid exceptions, but we speak of the immense majority of theological books. It is wonderful how men can think and write upon religion to so little effect. That a theme so vast, so sublime as Christianity, embracing God and man, earth and heaven, time and eternity, connected intimately with all human history, deriving lights from all human experience, admitting application to the whole of human life, and proposing, as its great end, the everlasting progress of the soul—that such a subject should be treated so monotonously, as to be proverbially dull—that its professed explorers should be able to plant their footsteps so exactly in the track of their predecessors—that the boundlessness of the field should so seldom tempt an adventurous spirit from the beaten way, is wonderful, and might seem a miracle to a man unacquainted with the vassalage which has broken down the mind in the department of religion. It is true, that those who write on this topic, are accustomed to call it sublime; but they make its sublimity cold and barren, like that of mountain tops, wrapped in everlasting snows. We write this, not in severity, but in sorrow of heart; for we despair of any great progress of the human character or of society, until the energies of the mind shall be bent, as they seldom have been, on those most important subjects and interests of the human mind, morals and religion.

As a striking proof of the poverty of religious literature, and of the general barrenness of the intellect when employed in this field, we may refer to the small amount of original and productive thought in the English Church, since the days of Barrow and Taylor. Could our voice be heard in England, we would ask impartial and gifted men, more familiar with their country's history than ourselves, to solve the problem, how a Protestant Establishment, so munificently endowed with the means of improvement, should have done so little, in so long a period, for Christianity—should have produced so few books to interest the higher order of minds? Let not these remarks be misunderstood, as if we were wanting in respect and gratitude to a Church, which, with all its defects, has been the bulwark of Protestantism—which has been illustrated by the piety and virtues of such men as Bishops Wilson, Berkeley, and Heber—and in which have sprung up so many institutions consecrated to humanity and to the diffusion of the Christian faith. We mean not to deny it the honour of having fostered talent in various forms and directions. Among the English clergy, we find profound and elegant scholars; we find the names of those giants in ancient learning, Bentley and Parr, and a crowd of proficients in polite literature, of whom Hurd and Jortin are honourable representatives. We speak only of the deficiency of their contributions to moral and religious science.

With the exception of Clarke and Butler, we could not easily name any of the Establishment, since the time above specified, who have decidedly carried forward the human intellect. The latter of these is, indeed, a great name, notwithstanding the alleged obscurities of his style, and worthy to be enrolled among the master spirits of the human race. In regard to commentators, whose function, as commonly executed, holds a second rank in theology, the English Church, since the time of Hammond, has produced none of much value, except Bishop Pearce. We presume that she will not lay claim to the heretical Locke, who carried into the interpretation of the Scriptures the same force of thought, as into the philosophy of the mind; or to Whitby, whose strenuous Arminianism, as Orthodoxy would reproachingly say, tapered off into that most suspicious form of Christianity—Unitarianism! We have not yet named two of the most illustrious intellectual chiefs of the Church, Warburton and Horsley. Their great power, we most readily own; but Warburton is generally acknowledged to have wasted his mind, and has left no impression of himself on later times; whilst Horsley, though he has given us striking, if not judicious, sermons, in a style of unusual vigour, cannot be said to have communicated, in any respect, a new impulse to thought; and in biblical criticism, to which he was zealously devoted, he is one of the last authorities on which a sound mind would lean. To Bishops Lowth and Sherlock we cheerfully acknowledge our obligations; and we question, whether the latter has ever yet received his due praise. We fear, that a higher place is given to Bishop Horne and his disciple Jones. The rank which these writers hold, does not testify favourably to the intellectual progress of the English Church. It is as dark an omen, as the value attached by the Calvinistic Dissenters to such writers as the Rev. Messrs. Scott and Newton. The piety of these men, we honour; but what must posterity think of the illumination of an age, which numbers these among its brightest lights! We have not forgotten, though we have not named, Tillotson, Secker, and Porteus. They are all worthy of remembrance, especially Secker, the clear and wise expounder of Christian ethics; but they added little or nothing to the stock which they received. It may be thought, that we have not been just to the Establishment, in passing over Paley. He has our sincere admiration. On one great topic, which indeed has been worthily treated by many of the clergy, we mean that of Christian evidence, he has shed new light. By felicity of arrangement and illustration, he has given an air of novelty to old arguments, whilst he has strengthened his cause by important original proofs. His *Horæ Paulinæ* is one of the few books destined to live. Paley saw what he did see, through an atmosphere of light. He seized on the strong points of his subject with an intuitive sagacity, and has given his clear, bright thoughts, in a style which has made them the property of his readers, almost as perfectly as they were his own. In what, then, did he fail? We have said, that he was characterized by the distinctness of his vision. He was not, we think, equally remarkable for its extent. He was popular, rather than philosophical.

He was deficient in that intellectual thirst, which is a chief element of the philosophical spirit. He had no irrepressible desire to sound the depths of his own nature, or to ascend to wide and all-reconciling views of the works and ways of God. Moral philosophy he carried backward, nor had he higher claims in religious, than in ethical science. His sermons are worthy of all praise, not indeed for their power over the heart, but for their plain and strong expositions of duty, and their awakening appeals to the conscience.

We leave this topic, with observing, that in the noblest branch of history, we mean Christian or ecclesiastical history, the English Church has not furnished a single distinguished name. We have one mournful and decisive proof of this deficiency. The vast majority of English readers learn what they know of the progress and fortunes of their religion, from its foe and insulter—from Gibbon, the apostle of unbelief. The history of Christianity, the most important and sublime theme in this province of literature, has, as yet, found no writer to do it justice, none to be compared with the great names in civil history. The mightiest revolution in the records of our race, remains to be worthily told. We doubt, indeed, whether the true character, style, and extent of the work which is needed, are, as yet, comprehended. That the same rigorous impartiality, the same spirit of philosophical research into causes and effects, is to be carried into religious as into civil history, is imperfectly understood. The records of particular sects and churches, instead of exhausting this great subject, are, perhaps, subordinate parts. We want to know the great conflict between Christianity and Heathenism, and the action and reaction of these systems on one another. We want to know the influences of Christianity on society, politics, manners, philosophy, and literature, and the modifications which it has received in return from all these mighty agents. We know not where history can find a nobler field for its graphic powers, than in the chivalrous ages of Christianity; nor can it find, in its whole range over the past, a subject so fitted, as the spread and fortunes of this religion, to its great end, which is, to throw light on the nature and powers of man, and to carry us deep into the human soul. When is this greatest and most lamentable chasm in our literature, to be supplied?

We have cited the English Church as a proof of the unproductiveness of the intellect in religion, and of the barrenness of theological literature. Had we time, we might find corroborations in other sects. In truth, a paralyzing influence has been working mightily for ages in the Christian world; and we ought not to wonder at its results. Free action has been denied to the mind, and freedom is an essential condition of growth and power. A fettered limb moves slowly, and operates freely. The spirit pines away in a prison; and yet to rear prison-walls round the mind has been the chief toil of ages. The mischiefs of this intellectual bondage, are, as yet, we conceive, but imperfectly known, and need to be set forth with a new eloquence. If, as we believe, progress be the supreme law of the soul, and the very aim of its

creation, then no wrong can be inflicted on it so grievous, as to bind it down everlastingly to a fixed, unvarying creed, especially if this creed was framed in an age of darkness, crime, and political and religious strife. This tyranny is pre-eminently treason against human nature. If growth be the supreme law and purpose of the mind, then the very truth which was suited to one age, may, if made the limit of future ones, become a positive evil; just as the garment in which childhood sports with ease and joy, would irritate and deform the enlarging frame. God having framed the soul for expansion, has placed it in the midst of an unlimited universe, to receive fresh impulses and impressions without end; and man, "dressed in a little brief authority,' would sever it from this sublime connexion, and would shape it after his own ignorance, or narrow views. The effects are as necessary as they are mournful. The mind, in proportion as it is cut off from free communication with nature, with revelation, with God, with itself, loses its life, just as the body droops, when debarred from the fresh air and the cheering light of heaven. Its vision is contracted, its energies blighted, its movement constrained. It finds health, only in action. It is perfect, only in as far as it is self-formed. Let us not be misapprehended. We mean not to deny, that the mind needs the aid of human instruction, from the cradle to the grave; but this it needs as a material to act upon, and not as a lesson to be mechanically learned. The great aim of instruction should be, to give the mind the consciousness and free use of its own powers. The less of instruction the better, if it only propose to engender a slavish dependence, and an inert faith. The soul often owes its best acquisitions to itself. They come to it from glimpses of its own nature, which it cannot trace to human teaching—from the whispers of a divine voice—from stirrings and aspirations of its own unfolding and unbounded energies—from the indistinct dawning of new truths—or from the sudden brightening of old truths, which, if left to act freely, work a mighty revolution within. Against these inspirations, if so they may be called, which belong to the individual, and which are perpetually bursting the limits of received ideas, the spirit of religious tyranny wages its chief and most unrelenting war. It dreads nothing so much as a mind, in which these diviner motions manifest themselves in power. That it should have so succeeded in checking and stifling them, is one of the very mournful reflections forced on us by human history. We have here one great cause of the sterility of theological literature. Religion, by being imposed as a yoke, has subdued the faculties, which it was meant to quicken; and, what is most worthy of remark, like all other yokes, it has often excited a mad resistance, which has sought compensation for past restraints, in licentiousness, and disgraced the holy name of freedom, by attaching it to impiety and shameless excess.

A great subject has led us far from our author. We return to him with pleasure. We welcome, as we have said, a book from Fenelon; and we do so, because, if not a profound, he was an original thinker, and because, though a Catholic, he was essentially

free. He wrote from his own mind, and seldom has a purer mind tabernacled in flesh. He professed to believe in an infallible Church; but he listened habitually to the voice of God within him, and speaks of this in language so strong, as to have given the Quakers some plea for ranking him among themselves. So little did he confine himself to established notions, that he drew upon himself the censures of his Church, and, like some other Christians whom we could name, has even been charged with a refined Deism. His works have the great charm of coming fresh from the soul. He wrote from experience; and hence, though he often speaks a language which must seem almost a foreign one to men of the world, yet he always speaks in a tone of reality. That he has excesses, we mean not to deny; but they are of a kind which we regard with more than indulgence, almost with admiration. Common fanaticism, we cannot away with; for it is essentially vulgar, the working of animal passions, sometimes of sexual love, and oftener of earthly ambition. But when a pure mind errs, by aspiring after a disinterestedness and purity not granted to our present infant state, we almost reverence its errors; and still more, we recognise in them an essential truth. They only anticipate and claim too speedily the good for which man was made. They are the misapprehensions of the inspired prophet, who hopes to see in his own day, what he was appointed to promise to remoter ages.

Fenelon saw far into the human heart, and especially into the lurkings of self-love. He looked with a piercing eye through the disguises of sin. But he knew sin, not, as most men do, by bitter experience of its power, so much as by his knowledge and experience of virtue. Deformity was revealed to him by his refined perceptions, and intense love of moral beauty. The light which he carried with him into the dark corners of the human heart, and by which he laid open its most hidden guilt, was that of celestial goodness. Hence, though the severest of censors, he is the most pitying. Not a tone of asperity escapes him. He looks on human error with an angel's tenderness, with tears which an angel might shed, and thus reconciles and binds us to our race, at the very moment of revealing its corruptions.

That Fenelon's views of human nature were dark, too dark, we learn from almost every page of his writings; and at this, we cannot wonder. He was early thrown into the very court, from which Rochefoucauld drew his celebrated Maxims, perhaps the spot, above all others on the face of the earth, distinguished and disgraced by selfishness, hypocrisy, and intrigue. When we think of Fenelon in the palace of Louis XIV. it reminds us of a seraph sent on a divine commission into the abodes of the lost; and when we recollect that in that atmosphere he composed his Telemachus, we doubt whether the records of the world furnish stronger evidence of the power of a divine virtue, to turn temptation into glory and strength, and to make even crowned and prosperous vice, a means of triumph and exaltation. Another cause of Fenelon's unjust views of human life, may be found, we think, in his profession. All professions tend to narrow and obscure

the intellect, and none more than that of a priest. We know not, indeed, a nobler or more useful function, than that of the Christian minister; but superstitious notions and an imagined sanctity, have severed him more or less from his race, especially in a Church which dooms him to celibacy; and from this unnatural, insulated position, it is impossible for him to judge justly of his kind. We think, too, that Fenelon was led astray by a very common error of exalted minds. He applied too rigorous and unvarying a standard to the multitude. He leaned to the error of expecting the strength of manhood in the child, the harvest in seed-time. On this subject, above all others, we feel that we should speak cautiously. We know that there is a lenity towards human deficiencies, full of danger; but there is, too, a severity far more common, and perhaps more ruinous. Human nature, as ordinarily exhibited, merits rebuke; but whoever considers the sore trials, the thick darkness, the impetuous will, the strong passions, under which man commences his moral probation, will temper rebuke with pity and hope. There is a wisdom, perhaps the rarest and sublimest attainment of the intellect, which is at once liberal and severe, indulgent and unbending; which makes merciful and equitable allowance for the innocent infirmities, the necessary errors, the obstructions and temptations of human beings, and at the same time asserts the majesty of virtue, strengthens the sense of accountableness, binds on us self-denial, and points upward, with a never-ceasing importunity, to moral perfection as the great aim and only happiness of the human soul. We will not say that Fenelon was a stranger to this broad, comprehensive wisdom, but we cannot name it as his chief distinction.

We have said that we welcome the book under consideration, because it came from so pure and gifted a mind. We add, that we do not welcome it the less for coming from a Catholic. Perhaps we prize it the more; for we wish that Protestantism may grow wiser and more tolerant, and we know not a better teacher of these lessons than the character of Fenelon. Such a man is enough to place within the pale of our charity, the whole body to which he belonged. His virtue is broad enough to shield his whole Church from that unmeasured, undistinguishing reprobation with which Protestant zeal has too often assailed it. Whoever remembers, that the Catholic communion numbers in its ranks more than one hundred millions of souls, probably more than all other christian churches together, must shudder at the sentence of proscription, which has sometimes been passed on this immense portion of human beings. It is time that greater justice were done to this ancient and wide-spread community. The Catholic Church has produced some of the greatest and best men that ever lived, and this is proof enough of its possessing all the means of salvation. Who, that hears the tone of contempt, in which it is sometimes named, would suspect that Charlemagne, Alfred, Dante, Raphael, Michael Angelo, Tasso, Bossuet, Pascal, Des Cartes, were Catholics? Some of the greatest names in arts and arms, on the throne and in the pulpit, were worn by Catholics. To come down to our own times, has not the metropolis of

New England witnessed a sublime example of Christian virtue in a Catholic bishop? Who, among our religious teachers, would solicit a comparison between himself and the devoted Cheverus? This good man—whose virtues and talents have now raised him to high dignities in Church and State, who now wears, in his own country, the joint honours of an archbishop and a peer—lived in the midst of us, devoting his days and nights, and his whole heart, to the service of a poor and uneducated congregation. We saw him declining, in a great degree, the society of the cultivated and refined, that he might be the friend of the ignorant and friendless—leaving the circles of polished life, which he would have graced, for the meanest hovels—bearing, with a father's sympathy, the burdens and sorrows of his large spiritual family—charging himself alike with their temporal and spiritual concerns—and never discovering, by the faintest indication, that he felt his fine mind degraded by his seemingly humble office. This good man, bent on his errands of mercy, was seen in our streets under the most burning sun of summer, and the fiercest storms of winter, as if armed against the elements by the power of charity. He has left us, but not to be forgotten. He enjoys among us, what, to such a man, must be dearer than fame. His name is cherished, where the great of this world are unknown. It is pronounced with blessings, with grateful tears, with sighs for his return, in many an abode of sorrow and want; and how can we shut our hearts against this proof of the power of the Catholic religion, to form good and great men?

These remarks, we trust, will not be perverted. None will suspect us of Catholic partialities. Of all Protestants, we have fewest sympathies with the Romish Church. We go farther than our brethren, in rejecting her mysteries, those monuments of human weakness; and as to her claims to infallibility, we repel them with an indignation not to be understood by sects, which, calling themselves Protestant, renounce in words, but assert in practice, a Popish immunity from error—a Popish control over the faith of their brethren. To us, the spiritual tyranny of Popery is as detestable as oriental despotism. When we look back on the history of Papal Rome, we see her, in the days of her power, stained with the blood of martyrs, gorged with rapine, drunk with luxury and crime. But what then? Is it righteous to involve a whole Church in guilt, which, after all, belongs to a powerful few? Is it righteous to forget, that Protestantism, too, has blood on her robes? Is it righteous to forget, that Time, the greatest of reformers, has exerted his silent purifying power, on the Catholic, as well as on ourselves? Shall we refuse to see, and to own with joy, that Christianity, even under Papal corruptions, puts forth a divine power?—that men cannot wholly spoil it of its celestial efficacy?—that, even under its most disastrous eclipse, it still sheds beams to guide the soul to heaven?—that there exists in human nature, when loyal to conscience, a power to neutralize error, and to select and incorporate with itself, what is pure and ennobling in the most incongruous system? Shall we shut our eyes on the fact, that, among the clergy of the Romish Church, have risen up illustrious imitators of that magnanimous Apostle

before whom Felix trembled; men, who, in the presence of nobles and kings, have bowed to God alone—have challenged for his law, uncompromising homage, and rebuked in virtue's own undaunted tone, triumphant guilt? Shall we shut our eyes on the fact, that from the bosom of this corrupt Church, have gone forth missionaries to the east and the west, whose toils and martyrdom, will not be dimmed by comparison with what is most splendid in Protestant self-sacrifice? We repeat it, not boastingly, but from deep conviction, that we are exceeded by no sect in earnestness of desire, for the subversion of the usurped power of the Catholic Church—of its false doctrines—and of its childish ceremonies, so often substituted for inward virtue. We believe that these have wrought, and still work great evil. Still we see, and delight to see, among those who adhere to them, the best attributes of men and Christians. Still we are accustomed to refresh our piety by books which Catholics have written. Still we find one of our highest gratifications in those works of art, in which Catholic genius has embodied its sublime and touching conceptions of the form and countenance of Jesus; has made us awed witnesses of his miracles and cross; companions of his Apostles; and admirers, with a tender reverence, of the meek, celestial beauty of his sainted mother. With these impressions, and this experience, we cannot but lift up our voices against Protestant as well as Papal intolerance. We would purify Protestantism from the worst stain and crime of Rome, her cruel bigotry, her nefarious spirit of exclusion.

The Detector.—No. 1.

If there's a hole in a' your coats,
I rede you tent it,
A chiel's amang you takin' notes,
And, mind, he'll prent it.—BURNS.

Oh, an' you talk of consience, I must have mine eye upon you.—
SHAKSPEARE.

IT was, I think, an accurate knowledge of human nature, which dictated the remark of that incorruptible patriot, and sincere lover of human happiness, FLETCHER of SALTOUN, "Make who will the laws of a country, give me only the writing of its ballads." The spirit of the observation is as applicable to the progress of religious as of political knowledge. Whatever enactments a government may pass, in opposition to free inquiry, or in condemnation of a particular faith, though the supposed misbeliever may be excluded from the world's honours, and his opinions be branded by public odium; yet even against such fearful odds, will truth, and sometimes even error, make head—buffeting with sinewy nerve the current of prejudice, and gaining disciples by the very measures which were meant to crush its dissemination. If, proverbially,

the blood of the martyrs be the seed of the Church, it is no less a truth, that in persecution's school, the strong and godlike energies of humanity are elicited; and efforts will there often be made, for man's rights and the Almighty's glory, which put to shame those dwarf-like conceptions and labours, which too commonly characterize the people when they are "at ease in Zion." But let all religious denominations enjoy an equality of privileges—let there be "an open field, and no favour:" yet, if relying on the adage of Truth's omnipotence, the means by which it is to acquire the throne of dominion be neglected; if the possession of the public ear be yielded, without a struggle, to any class, who, knowing its value, aim at securing it, it surely needs no prophet to divine the inevitable result. The axiom, unless there be a cause there can be no effect, is as true when applied to morals and religion, as it is in philosophy. It is while men sleep, that the enemy sows tares.

When, however, there is a deep-rooted antipathy in the public mind, to any particular sentiments; when "all that the nurse and all the priest has taught" is confirmed by fashion's powerful laws, and the seductive pleadings of interest, backed likewise by the anathemas of an Established Church; if, under these circumstances, the believers in the obnoxious and misrepresented faith, sit idly by, and allow the full tide of calumny to sweep past them, without an attempt to resist its demoralising influence; if they will not strive to strip the scales of prejudice from the intellectual vision of the public; if, with stoical indifference, they can witness the character of the Father dishonoured, outraged, the moral loveliness of the Saviour lessened, degraded, destroyed; if no feeling of gratitude to God induce them to stand up for insulted and traduced human nature; if the improvement of themselves and children, the freedom of the mind, the eternal happiness of mankind, founded on individual virtue, and secured by divine benevolence, be not all-sufficient motives to lead them to "be fervent in spirit, serving the Lord,"—ought any one to be surprised at the slow progress of what they deem truth?—is not a weighty, a fearful responsibility incurred?

No one, I think, can look round on the Unitarian portion of the Christian world, and not acknowledge the supineness by which many of its members are characterized. It is to that supineness that I attribute much of the ignorance so prevalent, as to what really is the Unitarian faith. By numbers, it is supposed, that Unitarians believe neither

in God nor devil; others imagine, that Christ is altogether rejected; and the surprise, the astonishment which some have experienced, when, on entering our assemblies, they have heard the Saviour preached, in all the divinity of his mission, his doctrines, his precepts, and the hopes he has inspired, has been at once gratifying to our love of Gospel truth, and a severe rebuke to the negligence which had so long held a brother man in the chains of mental slavery. There are those who cannot be persuaded, that Unitarians celebrate the Lord's Supper; whilst others, because they in verity comply with the dying exhortation of their revered Master and Lord, pronounce them to be idolators. One class affirm, that Unitarians believe in purgatory; another, that they reject the resurrection; they are styled *merit-mongers*, because they declare, with the Apostle, "that without holiness, no man shall see the Lord;" again, they are said to be the promoters of every species of immorality, because they deny the divinity of the Epistles! Can it be proper that these vituperations should go unchecked? Is it fitting that libels and calumnies should be daily uttered and reiterated, till, from their constant repetition, those who know better, are almost persuaded of their validity, and no voice of warning be raised—no attempt at exposure be made? "Shall Truth be silent, because Error frowns," and babbles, and anathematizes? No: surely, no. Rather should the spirit be stirred up, to brave the encounter with fanatic ignorance and sectarian presumption, nor should any missile, hurled by however worthless an opponent, be unnoticed or unregarded. If it be a theological Goliah, who, in the pride of his orthodoxy, defies the armies of the living God, let him feel that "a smooth stone out of the brook," though cast by a feeble hand, and though, agreeably to the intellectual character of the times, it present a different appearance to the more "carnal weapon," is yet of power sufficient to cause polemic arrogance to bite the dust. And if hoary-headed ignorance, wearing the garb of sanctity as its protection, or youthful conceit, fancying itself secure by its obscurity, should venture to assail the character and impugn the motives of others, whose only crime is, that they differ from them in matters of religion, let them be taught that "the school-master is abroad," and that he is as able as willing to chastise arrogance, and instruct those who are in darkness. That I may not be accused of proposing to others, labours in which I would not cheerfully engage myself, if

the Editor of the Christian Pioneer approve of my remarks, I shall be glad to bear my part in noticing any thing which may present itself to my observation, either in Scottish periodicals, or the language and conduct of the religious teachers of the land, which may appear to me to demand exposure and correction.

In the Edinburgh Christian Instructor for February, there is a long and laboured Article on Dr. Channing's Discourse at the installation of Mr. Motte. That it should be noticed at all in that work, is well. It may induce some persons to read it, whose attention might not otherwise have been directed to its pages. That the notice should exhibit all the acrimony by which the Instructor is usually distinguished, surprises me not. Misrepresentation and calumny, in that quarter, past experience would lead me to expect. But scarcely, even from the Instructor, was I prepared to meet the ignorance and apocryphal statement which that Article manifests. The Reviewer begins by affirming, "To the Unitarians of this country, we owe the reprint of this discourse." This is untrue. It was reprinted in Edinburgh, by a highly respectable bookselling firm, entirely, I believe, on their own account, and without the knowledge of a single Unitarian. But this calumny is invented in order to heap odium on the Unitarians, whose motive, it is afterward said, was, under colour of Channing's fame as a writer on Milton and Napoleon, to vend "the poison of heresy," and "to give currency to an insolvent bank-note." The metaphors are as accurate as the statement. The Reviewer is equally correct in his assertion, that it is on the ground of Channing's *literary* fame, "that he is now introduced to the British public as a theologian." Introduced!—Good. Why, it was as a theologian that "the British public" became acquainted with Dr. Channing. It was, amongst other publications, that admirable exposition and defence of Christian Unitarianism, preached at Baltimore in 1819, and that luminous and powerful statement of the evidences of Christianity, delivered before the University in Cambridge, Massachusets, in 1821, which called up in the public mind, an anxiety to read any work which Channing might afterwards publish. Of these sermons, to say nothing of other discourses, several editions have been printed both in England and Ireland, and many thousand copies have been circulated, and, I believe, nearly 20,000 of one of them in America. Nay, had it been even the

Scottish public to whom the Reviewer affirmed, that Dr. Channing was now to be introduced, in his true, and most honourable, and most dignified character, as a preacher of the gospel of Christ, the assertion would have been baseless. Had he looked into Blackwood's Magazine, of a few years back, he might have seen that Dr. Channing was noticed, as one of the most talented and powerful sermon writers of the age. It was, therefore, Dr. Channing's reputation as a theologian, that paved the way to his literary fame; and the calumnious aspersions of the Reviewer can only defile their author. Any denomination may well feel themselves honoured, in the association and advocacy of so gifted a man as Channing; but let the Reviewer be assured, that the Unitarians needed not his mantle to cast around their principles, even though it had the virtues ascribed to that of the Prophet. Believing their sentiments to be those of reason and Scripture, they seek no cloak to hide, nor insidious means to advance, their dissemination.

A man who purchases a *sermon*, and yet is thereby "introduced by *surprise* into a theological dissertation," must be an individual, it is imagined, whom no "dissertation" would benefit. His proper place would be at a school. The readers of the Christian Pioneer will have formed a different idea of this sermon—see vol. iii. p. 3–10, and 44–50—from that announced by the Reviewer, when he avers, "It is framed to set suspicion asleep, to strip the reader insensibly of his faith, without provoking his opposition." To most readers, on this side of the Tweed especially, the very word Unitarian, which occurs in the opening pages of the discourse, would have, I suspect, the directly opposite effect of an opiate; for in Scotland it is the tocsin of danger. It seems to me, that no person could read that sermon, and doubt, for a moment, that it was the teachings of Christian Unitarianism he was perusing.

The limits to which I must confine this sketch, preclude me from pointing out all the misrepresentations of the Reviewer. The object of the sermon, is, to describe the great design of Christianity—the perfection of the human soul; and Dr. Channing illustrates that design, by dwelling principally on the knowledge which the gospel imparts to man, of the *character of God*. The Reviewer thinks it preposterous to point out the end, without first providing the means for gaining it. I apprehend, however, that the absurdity lies with the Reviewer, and not with the author.

And if, as the Reviewer truly says, "The very conception of a Supreme Being has a tendency to purify and elevate the mind, by bringing before it the noblest object of thought;" and if, as Dr. Channing proves, the end of Christianity be to purify and elevate the mind, and Christ points out the character of God our Father, as the chief means of that purity and elevation, then has the Doctor done, what the Reviewer says he should have done and did not; and the guilt of being preposterous, is with him, who in one page brings a charge, which he contradicts in the preceding.

The Reviewer, with a disingenuousness worthy only of a bad cause, cuts out a sentence from its connection, and gives it to his readers as Dr. Channing's statement of the whole object of the Saviour's mission. The passage in its connection, occupies nearly pages 44 and 45 of the Pioneer. All that the Reviewer here gives, is, "By the cross of Christ—'[Christianity]'—it sets forth the spirit of self-sacrifice with an energy never known before, and in thus crucifying selfishness, frees the mind from its worst chain." And then he exclaims, in all the majesty of his orthodoxy, "This, then, is the summary of the Christian's faith. Christ died to set forth the spirit of self-sacrifice. Mysterious death for an end so simple! Laborious and costly scheme to accomplish nothing!" Spare your heroics, good Mr. Reviewer, for they are founded on a fraud. You knew when you penned those sentences, that you were maligning and falsifying the faith of your opponent. You knew that neither Dr. Channing, nor any Christian Unitarian, held that that sentence you garbled and detached from its connection, contained "the summary of the Christian's faith." You knew it, because two pages onward, you give a portion of the passage that preceded the sentence you misquoted. You knew, that from both your quotations, you left out what Channing states as especially the distinctive characteristics of the gospel. You knew, that at the close of the entire passage, which you have thus grossly misrepresented, the author declared, he had "hardly *glanced* at what Christianity contains." And knowing all this, you had the hardihood to traduce a man as much your superior in intellect, as he is, if such be your usual plan of conduct, in moral integrity. Yes, and you can talk, too, of the "practical impotency of Socinianism." Know you not the commandment, "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour?"

The Reviewer charges Dr. Channing with undervaluing Christianity—with not being satisfied with it "as it has come from the hands of God," and as being "offended by the clearness and simplicity which refutes his speculations." These charges are the common coin of the reputedly orthodox, spurious indeed and worthless, but passing current with the multitude. Their only effect on truly Christian minds, is, to excite compassion for the man who uses them. Of the views maintained by Christian Unitarians, especially as to the influence of the Spirit of God, the Reviewer is lamentably ignorant; imputing misrepresentation to Dr. Channing, whilst he himself is alone liable to the accusation. The word atonement is very rife in the pages of the Reviewer, it being, in his judgment, the essential point of Christianity, and that, without a belief in which, the Gospel would be valueless; and the charge is continually made or insinuated, that Unitarians believe it not. This again is untrue. They do believe the Scriptural doctrine of the atonement, that "the Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world." But *what* doctrine of atonement the Reviewer maintains, it is not so easy to ascertain. Some men think it necessary to talk a great deal about atonement, and it is the Shibboleth of the day; but it may be the atonement according to the Assembly's Catechism, or Dr. Wardlaw, or Archbishop Magee. If the term be used, the multitude are not over-scrupulous as to the meaning. It will be well both for his own reputation, and probably his peace, if before he write again, he should mark well that Scripture, "Understand first, and then rebuke."

The Reviewer expresses his parting regrets, that Dr. Channing's talents "should be enlisted in a cause so hostile to the interests of the religion and virtue of his country." He prophesies, that on the purity of the religion, depends the stability of the national morals of America. I think so too; only for the Reviewer's Calvinism, I would insert Unitarianism. But when he adds, "Socinianism is not the school in which national virtue will be exercised and trained to maturity;" and, presuming that by Socinianism he intends Unitarianism, I cannot but marvel, that he should have forgotten the great leaders in the American Revolution; that the compatriots, whose dying hour was hallowed by the rejoicings of millions, on their country's jubilee, did not occur to his memory; and, especially, that he who drew up that glorious Declaration of Independence, was not shadowed forth to his mind, a testimony,

that his assertion was unfounded, and his presages false. And if his vision were too limited to stretch across the waves of the Atlantic, he might have remembered, that the men to whom England is indebted for her most valuable lessons of freedom, whose mighty intellect led the way in the establishment of British liberty, and whose unswerving devotion to the rights of their fellow-countrymen, must ever be revered whilst fearless integrity is honoured upon earth —were the Christian Unitarians, Milton and Locke.

I have no wish to trench on the ground, which Mr. Yates so firmly and triumphantly occupies, in his controversy with Dr. Wardlaw; but there are one or two things, calling, I think, for a passing notice. Dr. Wardlaw, in all the superciliousness of spiritual pride, gives himself, he says, "very little concern" as to the views which the readers of the Christian Pioneer may have formed, on his dispute with Mr. Yates; "nor will the concern be much greater," he concludes, if, even after his last letter, they should still retain their opinions. But is this a feeling becoming a Christian? "Very little concern" about immortal souls! A Christian minister believes that some of his fellow-creatures entertain gross and dangerous errors, perilous to their salvation, destructive of Christian truth, tending to immorality; and he acknowledges, he feels "very little concern" about the matter. And this, too, from the man who twits the Unitarians for their indifference—for their want of zeal in the conversion of the heathen, and who calls on them to produce the Jews, and infidels, and sinners, whom they have turned from the error of their way.

The conclusion of Dr. Wardlaw's letter, is worthy its commencement. Having begun with indifference to human salvation, he finishes with the assumption of infallibility. "Being sick of debate," to use his own chaste and significant phraseology, and not being over-fond of "metaphysical discussion," (though the letters contain a tolerable quantity of it, by way of diverting the attention of the readers, I suppose, from the real merits and facts of the controversy,) Dr. Wardlaw strips the Pioneer of his Christian name, and by one stroke of his pen, deems the matter to be settled. Not so fast, good Doctor!—You demur to Mr. Yates, "in the capacity either of Grand Inquisitor, or even of Father Confessor;" be not surprised, therefore, that before bowing to your authority, either to give or take away titles, you are required to produce your patent, as the Protestant Pope. Remember, also, that the Christian Pioneer is not exclusively Unitarian. It, like yourself, wishes "to keep by the question, with whomsoever the result may associate" it, "What is written in the law? How readest thou?" Its pages are open freely to all denominations. It is, I believe, the only periodical in Scotland, which willingly admits the statement and defence of *any* religious party. The views of its Editor, certainly, are Unitarian, and his most strenuous efforts are devoted, to promote the practical adoption of that faith; but, I am persuaded, I can answer for him, when I say, that he had rather its course should at once be stopped, than that

it should be advanced by anathemas against the faith of others, or the encouragement of sectarian pride and unchristian feeling.

In a funeral sermon for Mrs. Ewing, Dr. Wardlaw, if I mistake not, affirmed, that the doctrine of the resurrection was an essential, if not the most essential doctrine of Christianity. Who believes that doctrine more firmly than the Christian Unitarian? Who have written more ably in its defence, than Christian Unitarians? On Dr. Wardlaw's own showing, therefore, they are entitled to the Christian name. But they appeal to a higher authority than his. And if, in their case, the language which Milton applied to "the new forcers of conscience, under the Long Parliament," be as applicable now as when originally uttered,—

> Men whose life, learning, faith, and pure intent,
> Would have been held in high esteem with Paul,
> Must now be named and printed heretics,
> By shallow ——— and Scotch what d'ye call"—

they feel themselves consoled and assured, midst the calumnious representations of their opponents, by Paul's affirmation, which is equally their own, "That is the word of faith which we preach, that if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved."

A word or two with the Rev. William Thomson of the Relief Church, Hutchesontown. Sundry announcements had forewarned the people, that the subject of his Lecture, on the 17th May, would be, "Unitarian morality as much opposed to Christian morality, as is the doctrine of Christ to the doctrine of devils!" But whether the Reverend defamer's second thoughts had imparted more wisdom to him than his first, or that his boldness failed him in the hour of trial, certain it is, that the discourse was deemed, even by his own partizans, to be a lame and impotent conclusion to so fearful a prologue; and by others, the affair was regarded almost as a theological hoax. The major portion of the discourse had little or no bearing on the matter propounded, though, perhaps, that was amply made up by the ignorance and confusion of ideas so palpable in the remainder. Mr. Thomson appears not to have read any Unitarian books, or, if he has, to very little purpose, for he talked of Hume, Godwin, and *other* Unitarians. Such ignorance, not to call it by a more appropriate name, is unpardonable in a professed Master in Israel. Why, the "Political Justice" would have taught him the sterling value of integrity and fair dealing; and had he really perused the writings of those whom he thus classed together, he might have learned, had his prejudices permitted him to receive instruction, that Godwin's views were as opposed to those of Hume, as are the Christian Unitarian's to those which he professed. But thus it is, that the ignorant are misled, and delusion is strengthened, and error perpetuated.

As a specimen of Mr. Thomson's reasoning, take the following:—"Unitarian morality must be barren, because the Gospel is the effect, and the Holy Ghost the cause, of Christian righteousness, and they deny the Holy Ghost altogether." How often must men be told, that the Christian Unitarian firmly believes,

that "God worketh in us to will and to do of his own good pleasure;" that he believes the Holy Spirit to be God himself; and that his gracious influences are constantly manifested, whilst his most glorious and perfect fulness was exhibited in Jesus Christ. Our enemy himself being judge, Unitarian and Christian morality is identical. I can only mention one other instance of Mr. Thomson's ignorance, and that is, his unqualified assertion that Unitarians deny the divinity of the Epistles, and that all the vice which exists, is owing to that denial. So that, according to this great authority, all wicked men are of the Unitarian persuasion! This is a new light, truly. I had previously thought, that the individuals whom the laws of their country sentence to execution, were almost universally of the orthodox communion. At least I have read of the expression of their confidence, that through the merits of their Redeemer, they were certain of heaven's bliss—that they felt the Spirit of God within them, assuring them of salvation. I have seen descriptions of criminals, whose face, it was affirmed by clergymen even, by a base prostitution of Scriptural language, "shone as the face of an angel." I have known "the consecrated elements of salvation" given to the malefactor—of absolution pronounced—and have heard, with loathing, of the gallows being thus converted into the stepping-place to eternal glory. But it seems all this was a mistake, and that it was the denial of the divinity of the Epistles, which caused the perpetration of enormities, and these which led the Unitarian minister to officiate at the fatal tree! This discovery is certainly an improvement, even upon Bishop Horsley's splenetic assertion, that "the moral good of the Unitarians, is sin."

The Unitarians deny the divinity of the Epistles, do they? If such be the fact, how shall we account for the labour which many of that denomination have bestowed upon that portion of the New Testament? What shall we say of my revered friend Mr. Belsham, having published "The Epistles of Paul," in 4 volumes, the result of the studies of thirty years of his valuable and useful life? What will even that accuser of the brethren, the Rev. William Thomson, plead in behalf of his ignorance, malice, and calumny, when he reads this sentence from the prelimary dissertation to Mr. Belsham's invaluable work, "It may be justly concluded, that the Apostle carried in his mind, at all times, in all places, and to the end of life, a complete and infallible knowledge of the doctrine of Christ; so that whatever he taught or wrote upon that subject, *is to be received as true, and as of* DIVINE AUTHORITY."

I take my leave of Mr. Thomson, by informing him, that if he be careful to practise the precepts of the Saviour, as contained in the Evangelists, he will be much better employed than in bringing "railing accusations" against others—that the parable of the prodigal son will read him and every other Calvinist a valuable lesson, both as a *father* and a Christian—that the parable of the talents will also prove to him, that the Almighty is not an austere being, reaping where he has not sown—that the sermon on the mount is the storehouse of Christian morality—and that he who frames his life on its commandments, will not be moved either by the ravings of fanaticism, or the roaring of many waters.—ARGUS.

THE

CHRISTIAN PIONEER.

No. 35. JULY, 1829. Vol. III.

Essay on the Reading, the Translation, and the Import of Prov. xiv. 10.

"Strict attention to the form and fashion of the sacred writings of the Old Testament, is not only useful and even necessary in the Translator, who is ambitious of preserving in his copy, the force, and spirit, and elegance of the original; it will be of great use to him, likewise, merely as an interpreter." *Bishop Lowth.*

IT may sometimes happen that an investigation of the text, of the rendering, and of the sense of a passage of Scripture, shall be favourable, at once, to the current reading and version of the author's words, and to the interpretation usually put upon them. Whether this will be the result of the observations which I shall now make on a memorable aphorism in the book of Proverbs, I presume not to say, but leave my readers to determine.

"The heart knoweth his own bitterness; and a stranger doth not intermeddle with his joy."

There seems to be no just occasion for disturbing the *text* of this verse. The various reading* which, according to Kennicott, some few manuscripts exhibit, harmonizes still more with the translation in the English Bible than the reading found in the printed editions of the Hebrew Scriptures.

But the same agreement does not exist in the *versions*.

To begin with the LXX.; we cannot well reconcile what follows, either with the original text, or with any variations of it that have come under our observation: "The heart of man is sensitive, his soul is sorrowful; and when it is cheerful, it has no admixture of arrogance.†

As might be expected, the Arabic conforms, substantially, to the LXX. Not so the Syriac, which accords with

* See Houbigant's note in loc. "notum faciens, in voce *Hiphil* (i. e. *evulgans.*") In the Vulgate, "cor quod *novit.*"

† As literal a translation as possible is here given. The various readings in Holmes' and Parsons' editions have been consulted, yet without affording the means of a more intelligible rendering.

the rendering by King James's translators; as does also the Targum.

Luther's rendering is peculiar, but clear and significant: "When the heart is depressed, no outward joy can afford relief." [*Wenn das herz traurig ist, so hilft keine ausserliche freude.*]

Diodati, with his accustomed perspicuity, translates the verse exactly as we read it in our own Bibles. Thus, too, Castalio: "*Sua cujusque mens animi tristitiam novit, nec ejus lætitiæ, consors est alius.*"

I subjoin Dathe's rendering: "*Suam quisque tristitiam cognitam habet sed nec lætitiæ ejus consors fit alius peregrinus et perspectam.*"

The list might with ease be extended. It will not, I think, be denied that the plurality of translators concur in the rendering by the authors of the received version; a presumption—and only a presumption—of its correctness. When divines and scholars so various, in point of time, of situation, and, it may perhaps be added, of religious opinion, are perceived to make one and the same rendering of a passage, the fact inclines us to believe that they translated from the same text, and, though it be not absolutely decisive of the accuracy of their version, will entitle their concurrence to great attention and respect.

It might be too much to maintain, that these clauses admit of no other translations. I believe, nevertheless, that they will bear none so readily as what I have copied from the received version: and its claims are fully established, in the event of its being sanctioned by the form and nature of the parallelism.

A striking variety exists in the *style* of Solomon's Proverbs. Some of them are clothed in plain and simple, others in metaphorical language; some take the shape of direct, others of indirect counsels. In some, two parallel clauses convey precisely the same meaning, though with a slight diversity of expression; in others, the clauses are reciprocally opposed, and hold forth a memorable and impressive contrast. Occasionally, as in the passage of which this essay treats, a sentence is propounded, either affirmatively or negatively: and in few words, a most comprehensive and weighty statement, illustrated in two but not dissonant examples, invites the reader's notice, asks his assiduous study, admits of a wide application, and authorizes, nay suggests, numerous conclusions, of no common interest and moment.

I presume the *meaning* of this proverbial maxim to be, that "most of the joys, as of the griefs of the human breast, can be known only by individual consciousness, and in a certain degree and sense are incommunicable."* The remark holds good of the bitterness of the heart occasioned by afflictions that come not within our control—by some which strike upon our tenderest domestic and social feelings; it applies to parental disappointments, however they be produced: to abused friendship, to violated confidence, to the sense of personal guilt, the upbraidings of the soul, the pains of remorse, and a man's just and complete dissatisfaction with himself. On the other hand, the gladness of the heart, like its sorrow, can be but imperfectly estimated and shared by strangers. We may class our joys as we class our griefs, under two general divisions: those which affect our outward circumstances, and those which have their origin and their cause, as well as their seat, in the mind itself. Some are effects of our sympathy with our fellow men, on their external and honourable prosperity; some, again, belong to happy and highly rewarded parents. There are joys, too, experienced by the wise and good, on beholding the gradual, however apparently slow advances of knowledge, truth, and virtue, and of the numerous blessings in their train, and on anticipating their perfect and everlasting triumph. Among the joys which have a direct reference to our own circumstances and internal state, those of an approving conscience, of genuine penitence, of devotion, benevolence, and religious faith and hope, claim the first rank; and with these, as with all which I have enumerated, the world cannot interfere; in their particular modifications, they are the exclusive property of the individual possessor. It is a long but useful train of thought to which the aphorism conducts us. Studious of brevity, let me invite every reader to accept and pursue these reflections as illustrative of the fact, that

> "The heart knoweth its own bitterness:
> And with its joy no man intermeddleth."

N.

---

* The French Genevan translation, in one of its latest editions, if not its last [1805], is here singularly concise yet familiar, modern and paraphrastical [*Personne ne sent mieux que nous-mêmes l'amertume de nos chagrins, et la douceur de nos plaisirs.*] In a preceding impression, it has been more successful, [*Le cœur de chacun connoit l'amertume de son ame, et un autre n'est point mele dans sa joie.*] 1747.

Dialogues on Religion.—No. 4.

(Concluded from page 354.)

T. You are strangely fond of contradiction; whatever other objections have been raised against instrumental music, I never heard it questioned that the organ had a powerful effect in elevating the devotional feelings. I must, once more, invoke Milton and his angels to my assistance,—

> "Then crown'd again; their golden harps they take,
> ——————— and with preamble sweet
> Of charming symphony, they introduce
> Their sacred song, and waken raptures high:
> No voice exempt; no voice but well could join
> Melodious part, such concord is in heaven."

A. Ay; here you have preludes and symphonies. I hope you do not justify *them* in Church music. Your amateurs, and those who wish to be thought so, will always talk in your strain. But these are not to be appealed to on religious subjects. I would rather consult the multitude. All parts of public worship, as well as preaching, should be adapted to the apprehension and feelings of the poor; and I am sure, *they* would decide in my favour. As for your musical people, those who are regularly and scientifically instructed, are altogether taken up with the composition and execution; some in admiring and others in finding fault. One discord will derange all their devotional feelings, perhaps set them a cursing: and those who are not capable of criticism, attend to the performance, particularly the anthem, as to any other musical entertainment. I question whether you yourself ever felt as St. Austin did on such occasions;—"Whenever," says he, "it happens, that I am more affected by the music than the sense, I feel that I have committed a sin, and would rather not hear the singer."

T. I cannot say that I ever did; and I should hope for pardon, if my wandering thoughts took no worse a course. I do not know, how they could be better employed. Can any thing be more pure and holy, or more conducive to heavenly contemplation than a church filled with celestial harmony?

A. These are fine words, and would sound well at a concert or oratorio. But do you really think, that you may introduce into Christian worship, whatever you please,

provided it be innocent and elegant as you say, or even calculated to excite devout feelings?

T. Why not? Is not this a principal end of Christian worship?

A. Because this would open a door for every kind and degree of superstition. If we may engraft on the Gospel, every mode of worship that we think innocent, elegant, and conducive to devotion, every one may innovate as far as he thinks right; and no one wishes for greater liberty than that. This principle would warrant most of the superstitions of Popery; for few of them are immoral in their own nature. I am told that High Mass is a very elegant and imposing exhibition; and in general, the formalities of the Church of Rome are calculated to excite pious emotions; at least their advocates and votaries think so, and that is enough on your scheme. You are partial to music; but, why should the other fine arts be excluded? Why should not the lovers of painting and statuary be gratified? perhaps an altar-piece or a crucifix, a Madonna or a tutelar saint, are better adapted to excite devout love, than an organ; and would unquestionably be felt by a vastly greater proportion of the people. They may also be resorted to at all times, and alone as well as in public. They would present themselves to the mind, when piously disposed in secret; and might reproach the sinner in the very moment of temptation. Are we to gratify the ears, and reprobate the devotion of the other senses; or are all the senses, in their turn, to get the better of reason, Scripture, and common sense? Such notions would have justified the Jewish converts in adhering to the Mosaical rites, and the Gentiles in retaining their idolatrous music and dancing: but the great care, and most difficult task of the Apostles, was to prevent both of these abuses.

T. Your mentioning the Jews, reminds me of a convincing argument in favour of instrumental music, for it made an important part of the service of the Temple. The Psalms of David are an ample proof of this; and if we still admit the poetry into our worship, why should we exclude the music? The bands of singers too, amounting to nearly 300, and the titles of the Psalms, show what a share sacred music had in the thoughts of "the man after God's own heart." There is also a passage, somewhere in Chronicles, which ascribes the employment of instru-

ments to the express command of God by his Prophets;* and gives a fine description of the religious concert.

A. This is very true of David; and no one should speak of him, in his capacity of Psalmist, without respect. He was a fine musician and poet, and (humanly speaking) owed his introduction at court, and consequently his elevation to the throne, to his skill in these arts. Solomon, too, was a magnificent prince, fond of the fine arts. Thus music gained a footing, but it made no part of the Mosaical Revelation; and though it had, the Ceremonial Law was abolished by the death of Christ, and carefully excluded from the Christian Church by the Apostles. An argument drawn from this practice, would equally, and even with more force, warrant the revival of the whole Ritual of the Jews, which was unquestionably of Divine appointment; and even of many practices, that were tolerated on account of the hardness of their hearts. Instrumental music was used only in the Temple, where the service was performed wholly by the Priests and Levites, without any participation on the part of the people, who stood at a great distance, without the inclosure, and were only witnesses of the sacrifices offered for the nation. It never obtained a footing in the Synagogue, from which the service and officers of the Church were borrowed; and if it had, that would be no warrant to us. Judaizing was the heresy that gave most trouble to the Apostles and apostolic fathers.

T. On the same principle, you might exclude psalmody; since neither was that practised in the Synagogue.

A. No: I only say, that if it were, it would have no authority with us. Congregational psalmody is a pure Christian ordinance, and to be regulated by apostolic precedents.

T. Give me leave to observe, that instruments were employed in worship before the delivery of the Law; and of course, had divine authority independent of it. In one of the Psalms, the Lord is said to have ordained psalms accompanied by the harp, timbrel, and psaltery, "for a testimony, when he went out through the land of Egypt."† And Miriam the Prophetess and sister of Moses and Aaron, accompanied her song of triumph with a timbrel; and "all the women went out after her with timbrels and dances."‡ As to the Synagogue, I must beg leave to set

* 2 Chronicles xxix. 25. † Psalm lxxxi. 2. ‡ Exodus xv. 21.

you right. There is extant an Epistle, ascribed to S. Girolamo, in which a chorus of bagpipes are noticed as being employed in the Synagogue.

A. Very well. If I consent to the timbrels; you must admit dancing girls into your form of worship. They are of equal weight; or rather of none at all. Your authority from Girolamo and his bagpipes, is too ridiculous to deserve attention. Our Saviour and his Apostles were habituated to the Temple service; yet though they sung many hymns, they never resorted to instrumental music; and this was not owing to poverty, for their instruments were cheap, and portable.

T. Don't you think, that their attendance at the Temple gives a sanction to the practice?

A. No; for none of them were of the tribe of Levi; therefore, none had any share in performing public worship; and our Lord made no opposition to Jewish corruptions, except when they interfered with moral duties. Such a reformation would have been impracticable, and even useless, since the whole was to be abrogated by his death. The primitive Church was composed of Jewish and Gentile converts, both of them accustomed to instrumental music in their devotions; but so abhorrent was it from their new religion, that they seem never to have thought of employing it, at least in the church. The Apostles had much trouble in preventing them from relapsing into their former practices in other respects; but never had occasion to prohibit the use of instruments.

T. I see we are breaking up new ground that I have not time for at present. The use of instruments by the Apostolic Churches, has admitted of much controversy.

A. True. It forms, however, a principal part of our subject. Will you have any objection to breakfast with me to-morrow? We may have occasion to dip into books. That will agree better with the breakfast table than with a peripatetic disputation. Perhaps, too, we may agree better there. It is certainly a little strange, that two such good friends should differ so much on every question that has arisen between us.—Good day.

LETTER VIII.

Christ's Resurrection to an Invisible State, compared with Natural Appearances: with additional Evidence.

It cannot be denied, that the two opposite states in which Jesus is represented to have alternately existed, in the period between his resurrection and ascension, are not very consistent with prevailing opinions respecting matter and spirit, at the present day. According to this representation, the body and spirit of a man are inseparably connected, intimately sympathising in the changes to which they are respectively subjected, and even, agreeably to the received ideas of their respective properties, being transmutable into each other. On the contrary, according to some metaphysical reasonings, body and spirit have no properties in common, and no mutual sympathy with respect to their fates and transitions; and many, with the evangelical narratives in their hands, have as little idea of the possibility of the transition of corporeity to spirituality, and *vice versa*, as those who witnessed the phenomena we have been describing.

The most direct answer that can be made to objections of this nature, is, that facts well supported by evidence, must be far more decisive in the establishment of truth, especially in its application to questions of so much subtilty, than abstruse ratiocinations, in which our gross faculties are ever prone to be bewildered and lost. The future state being altogether withdrawn from our senses, from whence all our present ideas are derived, is also, in a great degree, elevated above our most refined conceptions. Revelation is graciously afforded to aid the operations of the understanding, and correct its aberrations, in relation to this difficult but all-interesting subject. It is pleasing, however, to observe, that the most palpable facts presented to our ordinary observation, and the most accurate researches of anatomists and philosophers, appear to concur in exhibiting such views of the intimate connection between the mind of man, and his corporeal structure, as seem sufficiently to accord with the above representation. It is to the curious organization of his senses and nervous system, that man is indebted for all those impressions, by which he becomes acquainted with the external world; and it may, *at least*, be shrewdly questioned,

whether, without any knowledge of the *external* world, there could be any *internal* world to contemplate? whether, if knowledge, from every apparent entrance, were totally shut out, it could have any existence, or mind any reality whatever? Surely, without sensation, we must be as senseless as the inanimate clod on which we tread. But does not this dependence of mind upon the organs of sense, and the frame of nature surrounding them, plainly show the intimate and inseparable connection between matter and mind? if we may not go further and assert, that matter is transmutable into mind.

Perhaps the present state of philosophy may conduct us one additional step in this difficult investigation. It enables us to show, that the gross observations of our senses often completely deceive us. What is more generally believed, than the existence of contact? And yet, in all the ordinary instances in which it is supposed to exist, the effect which is so termed, can be proved to be the result of repulsion between bodies which are not actually contiguous. The particles of the hardest metal do not touch each other, for they can be brought nearer by lowering their temperature, or withdrawing a portion of their latent caloric. Thus, what is termed contact, appears to be only a principle of resistance; which resistance, even in the ordinary course of nature, can be increased or diminished to an indefinite extent. The most solid substances can be transmuted into the lightest air, if not into the subtlest ether, and that again re-transmuted into the firmest solid. Again, the electric fluid, that most subtle and active species of matter, if such it can be termed, the existence of which can, in many cases, only be discovered by its wonderful effects, pervades universal nature, but is peculiarly active upon the nervous system, so as to be intimately connected with sensation and voluntary motion. If operations, so far from the cognizance of our senses, can be continually carrying forward in the course of nature, what still more subtle and refined effects may not be produced by its Almighty Author? Why may not the whole organization of man, and all its operations, be withdrawn from the sphere of the present system of nature, so as to be liable to none of its decomposing influences, and subject to no dissolution or decay? And again, for the purpose of making known to his "brethren" of this life, the glorious change which he had undergone, why

might not the Lord of human salvation, be enabled to return back to the ordinary state of humanity, in such a manner as to afford indubitable evidence that he had been in a very different state—a state, however, in which he retained his essential sameness, and was intimately acquainted with all their proceedings, and deeply interested in them? Were not they, and are not all mankind through their attestation, in the highest degree, concerned to know the reality of a change which awaits all his genuine disciples; and at some period, with variations, perhaps, proportioned to their moral deserts and demerits, the whole human race?

From the day of the resurrection of Jesus, to that of his ascension, including the latter, four manifestations of his person are distinctly recorded, each of which appears to have been attended with its peculiar advantages, for evincing that his entire person was both restored to life, and translated to a celestial immortality. It will be recollected, that the incredulity of the Apostle Thomas furnished the occasion for the re-appearance of his Master, after the very same manner as on the former occasion, and to his affording him those additional proofs which he had required. The superior calmness with which this second appearance from invisibility would be contemplated, together with the new proofs of the corporeity and identity of Jesus, and the knowledge he manifested of their intercourses when withdrawn from their observation, during an interval of eight days, were all admirably adapted to establish his existence in both states, and that when invisible, he remained essentially the same person. There are few subjects, perhaps, attended with greater difficulty, or which have given rise to more perplexity and diversity of sentiment, than that of the preservation of personal identity amid the great changes which we must necessarily undergo, in passing from the present to the future existence. Now, the repeated alternations of the man Jesus from one of these states to the other, and *vice versa*, with the proofs he gave of mental sameness, and of great activity in presenting himself when and wherever his visible presence seemed requisite, are practical illustrations of the subject. Let us place ourselves in the situation of the disciples. We experience, that, from the period of his resurrection, he was ordinarily withdrawn from observation; we have every reason to conclude, that he then became invisible, since he eluded the observation of persons whose

office it was to keep the body in custody, but from whom he was released by the appearance of a glorious and powerful personage, *from* invisibility. By this transfer of the body or person of Jesus into an invisible state, his predicted resurrection is accomplished; the same man is no longer an inanimate corpse, but is translated to a vivified spirit, probably of a kindred nature to that of the celestial messenger who underwent the opposite change on the occasion. That he is the same person, is verified by his repeated returns back to the ordinary state of a living man, exhibiting precisely the same bodily parts and functions, and the same mind and character, as previous to his decease. The apparent opposition of ideas between an invisible nature, and a solid tangible body, rendering it difficult to be conceived, that they can be alternated in the same individual, he embraces repeated opportunities of presenting it under circumstances under which it is impossible there could be any deception, when there could have been no ingress of solid bodies into the room where the witnesses are assembled, and what deserves particular remark, when their minds are in states the very opposite of anticipating the objects which were presented to their view. Invisible as he is, he is prompt to know and to be present at all proceedings of his disciples; he watches their every movement, their every state and change of mind! Of the sameness of his own mind and character, both when visibly present and when invisible, he affords irrefragable evidence. He discourses with them on the most interesting topics, relating to his past intercourses with them; and his language and actions have often a reference to what passed when they were apparently by themselves, and in conversation respecting him. In short, they appear to receive every evidence that mortals are capable of receiving, that their Lord was essentially the same, whether visible or invisible, corporeal or apparently incorporeal; or rather that, in his invisible state, his nature being elevated to superior vitality and corresponding activity, they were more thoroughly known, regarded, and protected by him at all times and places, with the same or even a purer ardour of affection, than while he constantly sojourned on earth, with the imperfections necessarily appertaining to this animal existence.

At the "third" manifestation of Jesus to his disciples on the lake of Tiberias, he partook *with* them of food of his own providing, the production of which in such abund-

ance, after they had been toiling all night unsuccessfully in search of it, would appear to proceed from a like state of invisibility as that in which he ordinarily existed; while his conversation brought to their recollection, some of the more interesting scenes of his past intercourses with them, and taught them to look forward to their great undertaking as his Apostles.

The appointed meeting in a mountain of Galilee, his native country, and the principal scene of his ministerial labours, but not of their cruel termination, would draw together an assemblage who most intimately knew, and were least prevented by aversion or fear from entering into a calm interview with him. Being by particular appointment, it would afford opportunities for preparation in order to the removing of any remaining difficulties respecting his corporeity, identity, and the great change he had undergone. This probably was the occasion on which more than five hundred persons were present, who were eventually enlisted among the number of his converts.

He lastly met his Apostles at Jerusalem, the scene of their subsequent labours, and after assuring them of the speedy fulfilment of his promise, that they should be aided by a supernatural mental influence in the discharge of their new and great undertaking, he was *gradually* withdrawn from their view by a glorious ascent to the visible heavens. There appears no solid reason to conclude that in this instance, any more than in the foregoing instances, he was withdrawn from opportunities of knowing what is passing upon our globe, and from what relates to the concerns of his disciples. Heaven is, in all probability, "not a place but a state of existence,"* and, as the Supreme Being is universally and most intimately present with all his works, though, in accommodation to our ordinary habits of thinking, he is occasionally represented as seated on a throne in the heavens, so there appears good reason to believe, that Jesus, in common with other celestial spirits, his associates in blessedness, has a much wider field of knowledge and action in the system of nature, than ourselves. And his last disappearance from his disciples, was probably intended to afford them a deliberate opportunity of witnessing his transition into that invisible and celestial state, in which, though he is withdrawn from the view of his brethren of mortality, he is, nevertheless, intimately acquainted with their proceedings. HOMO.

* See Mr. Bolsham's valuable discourse on "the Ascension of Christ."

The Character and Writings of Fenelon.

(Continued from page 367.)

It would give us pleasure to enlarge on the character of Fenelon, had we not proposed to ourselves another and still more important object in this review. But, in truth, this grateful duty has been so faithfully performed in the Memoir added to the Selections, that our readers will have no cause to complain of our declining it. This sketch of Fenelon overflows with fervent yet discriminating admiration, and gives utterance to affectionate reverence, with a calmness which wins our confidence. It is not easy to make extracts where the whole is so interesting. But as some of our readers may know Fenelon only by name, and as we wish all to know and love him, we insert a few passages.

"Fenelon, by mixing with all ranks and conditions, by associating with the unfortunate and the sorrowful, by assisting the weak, and by that union of mildness, of energy, and of benevolence, which adapts itself to every character, and to every situation, acquired the knowledge of the moral and physical ills which affect human nature. It was by this habitual and immediate communication with all classes of society, that he obtained the melancholy conviction of the miseries which distress the greater part of mankind; and to the profound impression of this truth through his whole life, we must ascribe that tender commiseration for the unfortunate, which he manifests in all his writings, and which he displayed still more powerfully in all his actions."—p. 263–4.

"In the course of his walks, he would often join the peasants, sit down with them on the grass, talk with them, and console them. He visited them in their cottages, seated himself at table with them, and partook of their humble meals. By such kindness and familiarity, he won their affections, and gained access to their minds. As they loved him as a father and friend, they delighted to listen to his instructions, and to submit to his guidance. Long after his death, the old people who had the happiness of seeing him on these occasions, spoke of him with the most tender reverence. 'There,' they would say, 'is the chair on which our good Archbishop used to sit in the midst of us; we shall see him no more,' and then their tears would flow.

"The diocese of Cambrai was often the theatre of war, and experienced the cruel ravages of retreating and conquering armies. But an extraordinary respect was paid to Fenelon by the invaders of France. The English, the Germans, and the Dutch, rivalled the inhabitants of Cambrai in their veneration for the Archbishop. All distinctions of religion and sect, all feelings of hatred and jealousy that divided the nations, seemed to disappear in the presence of Fenelon. Military escorts were offered him for his personal security, but these he declined, and traversed the countries desolated by war, to visit his flock, trusting in the protection of God. In these visits, his way was marked by alms and benefactions. While he was among them, the people seemed to enjoy peace in the midst of war.

"He brought together into his palace, the wretched inhabitants of the country whom the war had driven from their homes, and took care of them, and fed them at his own table. Seeing, one day, that one of these peasants ate nothing, he asked him the reason of his abstinence. 'Alas! my Lord,' said the poor man, 'in making my escape from my cottage, I had not time to bring off my cow, which was the support of my family. The enemy will drive her away, and I shall never find another so good.'

Fenelon, availing himself of his privilege of safe conduct, immediately set out, accompanied by a single servant, and drove the cow back himself to the peasant.

"'This,' said Cardinal Maury, 'is, perhaps, the finest act of Fenelon's life.'' He adds, 'Alas! for the man who reads it without being affected.' Another anecdote, showing his tenderness to the poor, is thus related of him. A literary man, whose library was destroyed by fire, has been deservedly admired for saying, 'I should have profited but little by my books, if they had not taught me how to bear the loss of them.' The remark of Fenelon, who lost his in a similar way, is still more simple and touching. 'I would much rather they were burned, than the cottage of a poor peasant.'

"The virtues of Fenelon give his history the air of romance; but his name will never die. Transports of joy were heard at Cambrai when his ashes were discovered, which, it was thought, had been scattered by the tempest of the Revolution; and to this moment the Flemings call him 'The Good Archbishop.'"—p. 274–5.

The Memoir closes in this touching strain:—

"When we speak of the death of Fenelon, we realize the truth of what we all acknowledge, though few feel, that the good man never dies; that, to use the words of one of our eloquent divines, 'death was but a circumstance in his being.' We may say, as we read his writings, that we are conscious of his immortality; he is with us; his spirit is around us; it enters into and takes possession of our souls. He is, at this time, as he was when living in his diocese, the familiar friend of the poor and the sorrowful, the bold reprover of vice, and the gentle guide of the wanderer; he still says to all, in the words of his Divine Master, 'Come to me, all ye that are heavy laden, and I will give you rest.'

"In the houses of the unlearned, where the names of Louis the Fourteenth and Bossuet have never entered, except as connected with Fenelon's, where not a word of his native tongue would be understood, his spirit has entered as a minister of love and wisdom, and a well-worn translation of his Reflections, with a short Memoir of his life, is laid upon the precious Word of God. What has thus immortalized Fenelon? For what is he thus cherished in our hearts? Is it his learning? his celebrity? his eloquence? No. It is the spirit of Christian love, the spirit of the Saviour of mankind, that is poured forth from all his writings; of that love that conquers self, that binds us to our neighbour, that raises us to God. This is Fenelon's power, it is this that touches our souls. We feel that he has entered into the full meaning of that sublime passage in St. John, and made it the motto of his life. 'Beloved, let us love one another; for love is of God; and every one that loveth, is born of God, and knoweth God. He that loveth not, knoweth not God; for God is love.'"—p. 282–3.

The translator has received and will receive the thanks of many readers, for giving them an opportunity of holding communion with the mind of Fenelon. Her selections are judicious, and she has caught much of that simplicity which is the charm of Fenelon's style. A want of coherence in the thoughts may sometimes be observed; and this, we may suppose, is to be ascribed, in part, to the author, whose writings seem to be natural breathings of the soul, rather than elaborate works of art; but still more to the translator, whose delicate task of selecting only what would suit and edify the Protestant mind, must have compelled her to make omissions and sudden transitions, not very favourable to order and connexion. We should be glad to enrich our pages with extracts, but want room.

We now come to our principal object. We propose to examine the most distinguishing views, or system of Fenelon. We say, his "system," for though he seems to write from immediate impulse, his works possess that unity which belongs to the productions of all superior minds. However he may appear to give his thoughts without elaboration or method, yet one spirit pervades them. We hear every where the same mild and penetrating voice, and feel ourselves always in the presence of the same strongly marked mind. What then were Fenelon's most characteristic views? It may be well to observe, that our principal aim in this inquiry, is, to secure our readers against what we deem exceptionable in his system. We believe, as we have said, that he is not free from excess. He is sometimes unguarded, sometimes extravagant. He needs to be read with caution, as do all who write from their own deeply excited minds. He needs to be received with deductions and explanations, and to furnish these is our present aim. We fear that the very excellencies of Fenelon may shield his errors. Admiration prepares the mind for belief; and the moral and religious sensibility of the reader may lay him open to impressions, which, whilst they leave his purity unstained, may engender causeless solicitudes, and repress a just and cheerful interest in the ordinary pleasures and labours of life.

What then are Fenelon's characteristic views? We begin with his views of God, which very much determine and colour a religious system; and these are simple and affecting. He seems to regard God but in one light, to think of him but in one character. God always comes to him as the Father, as the pitying and purifying friend of the soul. This spiritual relation of the Supreme Being, is, in the book before us, his all-comprehending, all-absorbing attribute. Our author constantly sets before us God as dwelling in the human mind, and dwelling there, to reprove its guilt, to speak to it with a still voice, to kindle a celestial ray in its darkness, to distil upon it his grace, to call forth its love towards himself, and to bow it by a gentle, rational sway, to chosen, cheerful, entire subjection to his pure and righteous will. Fenelon had fully received the Christian doctrine of God. He believed in him as the Universal Father, as loving every soul, loving the guiltiest soul, and striving with it to reclaim it to himself. This interest of the Creator in the lost and darkened mind, is the thought which predominates in the writings of this excellent man. God's care of the outward world, of men's outward interests, of the concerns of nations, seems scarcely to enter his mind. It is of God, present to the soul, as a reprover, enlightener, purifyer, and guide to perfection, that he loves to speak, and he speaks with a depth of conviction and tenderness, to which, one would think, every reader must respond.

We have seen the predominant view of the Supreme Being, in the writings which we are examining. He is a Spiritual Father, seeking the perfection of every soul which he has made. Another great question, carrying us still more deeply into Fenelon's mind, now presents itself. In what did he suppose this perfection of

the human soul to consist? His views on this subject may be expressed in two words, self-crucifixion and love to God. Through these, human perfection is to be sought. In these, and especially in the last, it consists. According to Fenelon, we are placed between two mighty attractions, self and God; and the only important question for every human being, is, to which of these hostile powers he will determine or surrender his mind. His phraseology on this subject is various, and indeed his writings are, in a great measure, expansions of this single view. He lays open the perpetual collisions between the principle of selfishness and the principle of religious love, and calls us, with his whole strength of persuasion, to sacrifice the first, to cherish and enthrone the last. This is his great aim. This he urges in a diversity of forms, some of which may be repeated, as helps to a better apprehension of his doctrine. Thus he calls us "to die to ourselves, and to live to God;"—"to renounce our own wills, and to choose the will of God as our only rule;"—"to renounce our own glory, and to seek the glory of God;"—"to distrust ourselves, and to put our whole trust in God;"—"to forget ourselves, and to give our thoughts to God;"—"to renounce ease, and to labour for God;"—"to sacrifice pleasure, and to suffer for God;"—"to silence our own passions, and to listen to the voice of God;"—"to crucify self-love, and to substitute for it the love of God;"—"to surrender our plans, and to leave all things to God." These passages give us Fenelon's theory of perfection. Self, as he teaches, is the great barrier between the soul and its Maker, and self is to vanish more and more from our thoughts, desires, hopes, trust, and complacency, and God to become all in all. Our own interests, pleasures, plans, advancements, all are to be swallowed up in an entire and unreserved devotion to the will of God.

Such is the doctrine of Fenelon, and it is essentially just. Self-crucifixion or self-sacrifice, and love to God, including love to his creatures, are the chief elements of moral perfection. The pure and noble mind of Fenelon, recognised, as by instinct, and separated from all inferior adjuncts, these essential constituents or attributes of Christian virtue; and there are passages in which he sets before us their deep and silent workings in the heart, and their beautiful manifestations in the life, with a delicacy, power, and truth, which can hardly be surpassed.

Still we think that Fenelon's exposition of his views is open to objection. We think that his phraseology, notwithstanding its apparent simplicity, is often obscure; that he has not set the due bounds to his doctrines; and especially, that refined minds, thirsting for perfection, may be led astray by his peculiar mode of exhibiting it. Our objections we will now state more fully.

We have said, that self-crucifixion and love to God, are, in Fenelon's system, the two chief constituents or elements of virtue and perfection. To these we will give separate attention, although, in truth, they often coalesce, and always imply one another. We begin with self-crucifixion, or what is often called self-sacrifice, and on this we chiefly differ from the expositions of our author. Perhaps the word *self* occurs more frequently than any other in

Fenelon's writings, and he is particularly inclined to place it in contrast with and in opposition to God. According to his common teaching, God and self are hostile influences or attractions, having nothing in common; the one, the concentration of all evil, the other, of all good. Self is the principle and the seat of all guilt and misery. He is never weary of pouring reproach on self, and, generally speaking, sets no limits to the duty of putting it to a painful death. Now, language like this has led men to very injurious modes of regarding themselves and their own nature, and made them forgetful of what they owe to themselves. It has thrown a cloud over man's condition and prospects. It has led to self-contempt, a vice as pernicious as pride. A man, when told perpetually to crucify *himself*, is apt to include under this word his whole nature; and we fear, that under this teaching, our nature is repressed, its growth stinted, its free movements chained, and, of course, its beauty, grace, and power, impaired. We mean not to charge on Fenelon the error of which we have spoken, or to hold him responsible for its effects. But we do think that it finds shelter under his phraseology, and we deem it so great, so pernicious, as to need a faithful exposition. Men err in nothing more than in disparaging and wronging their own nature. None are just to themselves. The truth on this great subject is indeed so obscured, that it may startle as a paradox. A human being, justly viewed, instead of being bound to general self-crucifixion, cannot reverence and cherish himself too much. This position, we know, is strong. But strong language is needed to encounter strong delusion. We would teach, that great limitations must be set to the duty of renouncing or denying ourselves, and that no self-crucifixion is virtuous, but that which concurs with and promotes self-respect. We will unfold our meaning, beginning with positions, which we presume will be controverted by none.

If we first regard man's highest nature, we shall see at once, that to crucify this, so far from being a duty, would be a crime. The mind, which is our chief distinction, can never be spoken or thought of too reverently. It is God's highest work, his mirror and representative. Its superiority to the outward universe, is mournfully overlooked, and is yet most true. This pre-eminence we ascribe to the mind, not merely because it can comprehend the universe, which cannot comprehend itself, but for still higher reasons. We believe, that the human mind is akin to that intellectual energy which gave birth to nature, and, consequently, that it contains within itself the seminal and prolific principles from which nature sprung. We believe, too, that the highest purpose of the universe, is to furnish materials, scope, and excitements to the mind, in the work of assimilating itself to the Infinite Spirit; that is, to minister to a progress within us which nothing without us can rival. So transcendent is the mind. No praise can equal God's goodness in creating us after his own spiritual likeness. No imagination can conceive of the greatness of the gift of a rational and moral existence. Far from crucifying this, to unfold it must ever be the chief duty and end of our being, and the noblest tribute we can render to its Author.

We have spoken of the mind, that highest part of ourselves, and of the guilt we should incur by crucifying or renouncing it. But the duty of self-crucifixion requires still greater limitations. Taking human nature as consisting of a body as well as mind, as including animal desire, as framed to receive pleasure through the eye, and ear, and all the organs of sense, in this larger view, we cannot give it up to the immolation which is sometimes urged. We see in the mixed constitution of man a beautiful whole. We see in the lowest as well as highest capacity an important use; and in every sense an inlet of pleasure not to be disdained. Still more, we believe, that he in whom the physical nature is unfolded most entirely and harmoniously, who unites to greatest strength of limbs the greatest acuteness of the senses, may, if he will, derive important aids to the intellect and moral powers from these felicities of his outward frame. We believe, too, that by a beautiful re-action, the mind, in proportion to its culture and moral elevation, gives vigour and grace to the body, and enlarges its sphere of action and enjoyment. Thus, human nature, viewed as a whole, as a union of the worlds of matter and mind, is a work worthy of a Divine Author, and its universal developement, not its general crucifixion, is the lesson of wisdom and virtue.

We go still farther. The desire of our own individual interest, pleasure, good, the principle which is ordinarily denominated self-love or self-regard, is not to be warred against and destroyed. The tendency of this to excess is indeed our chief moral danger. Self-partiality, in some form or other, enters into and constitutes chiefly, if not wholly, every sin. But excess is not essential to self-regard, and this principle of our nature is the last which could be spared. Nothing is plainer than that to every being his own welfare is more specially committed than that of any other, and that a special sensibility to it is imperiously demanded by his present state. He alone knows his own wants and perils, and the hourly, perpetual claims of his particular lot; and were he to discard the care of himself for a day, he would inevitably perish. It is a remark of great importance, that the moral danger to which we are exposed by self-love, arises from the very indispensableness of this principle, from the necessity of its perpetual exercise; for, according to a known law of the mind, every passion, unless carefully restrained, gains strength by frequency of excitement and action. The tendency of self-love to excess, results from its very importance, or from the need in which we stand of its unceasing agency, and is, therefore, no reason for its extermination, and no reproach on human nature. This tendency, however, does exist. It is strong. It is fearful. It is our chief peril. It is the precipice, on the edge of which we always tread. It is the great appointed trial of our moral nature. To this tendency, unresisted, tamely obeyed, we owe the chief guilt and misery of the present state, the extinction of charity, a moral death more terrible than all the calamities of life. This truth Fenelon felt and taught as few have done, and in his powerful warnings against this peril, the chief value of his writings lies. He treats, with admirable acuteness, the windings of self-partiality, shows how it

mixes with the best motives, and how it feeds upon, and so consumes our very virtues. All this is true. Still, self-love is an essential part of our nature, and must not and cannot be renounced.

The strong tendency of this principle to excess, of which we have now spoken, explains the strong language in which Fenelon and others have pointed out our danger from this part of our constitution. But it has also given rise to exaggerated views and modes of expression, which have contributed, perhaps, as much as any cause, to the universal want of a just self-respect. Self-love, from its proneness to excess and its constant movements, has naturally been the object of greater attention than any other principle of action; and men, regarding it not so much in its ordinary operations as in its encroachments and its triumphs over other sentiments, have come to consider it as the chief constituent of human nature. Philosophers, "falsely so called," have laboured to resolve into it all our affections, to make it the sole spring of life, so that the whole mind, according to their doctrine, may be considered as one energy of self-love. If, to these remarks, we add, that this principle, as its name imports, has self or the individual for its object, we have the explanation of a very important fact in the present discussion. We learn how it is, that self-love has come to be called by the name of *self*, as if it constituted the whole individual, and to be considered as entering into and forming human nature as no other principle does. A man's self-love, especially, when unrestrained, is thus thought to be and is spoken of as himself; and hence the duty of crucifying or renouncing himself, has naturally been urged by Fenelon, and a host of writers, in the broadest and most unqualified terms.

Now, it is not true that self-love is our only principle, or that it constitutes ourselves any more than other principles; and the wrong done to our nature by such modes of speech, needs to be resisted. Our nature has other elements or constituents, and vastly higher ones, to which self-love was meant to minister, and which are at war with its excesses. For example, we have reason or intellectual energy given us for the pursuit and acquisition of truth; and this is essentially a disinterested principle; for truth, which is its object, is of a universal, impartial nature. The great province of the intellectual faculty, is, to acquaint the individual with the laws and order of the divine system; a system, which spreads infinitely beyond himself, of which he forms a small part, which embraces innumerable beings equally favoured by God, and which proposes as its sublime and beneficent end the ever-growing good of the whole. Again, human nature has a variety of affections, corresponding to our domestic and most common relations; affections, which in multitudes overpower self-love, which make others the chief objects of our care, which nerve the arm for ever-recurring toil by day, and strengthen the wearied frame to forego the slumbers of night. Then, there belongs to every man the general sentiment of humanity, which responds to all human sufferings, to a stranger's tears and groans, and often prompts to great sacrifices for his relief. Above all, there is the

moral principle, that which should especially be called a man's self, for it is clothed with a kingly authority over his whole nature, and was plainly given to bear sway over every desire. This is eminently a disinterested principle. Its very essence is impartiality. It has no respect of persons. It is the principle of justice, taking the rights of all under its protection, and frowning on the least wrong, however largely it may serve ourselves. This moral nature especially delights in and enjoins a universal charity, and makes the heart thrill with exulting joy, at the sight or hearing of magnanimous deeds, of perils fronted and death endured, in the cause of humanity. Now, these various principles, and especially the last, are as truly ourselves as self-love. When a man thinks of himself, these ought to occur to him as his chief attributes. He can hardly injure himself more than by excluding these from his conception of himself, and by making self-love the great constituent of his nature.

We have urged these remarks, on the narrow sense often given to the word *self*, because we are persuaded, that it leads to degrading ideas of human nature, and to the pernicious notion, that we practise a virtuous self-sacrifice in holding it in contempt. We would have it understood, that high faculties form this despised self, as truly as low desires; and we would add, that when these are faithfully unfolded, this self takes rank among the noblest beings in the universe. To illustrate this thought, we ask the reader's attention to an important, but much neglected view of virtue and religion. These are commonly spoken of in an abstract manner, as if they were distinct from ourselves, as if they were foreign existences, which enter the human mind, and dwell there in a kind of separation from itself. Now religion and virtue, wherever they exist, are the mind itself and nothing else. They are human nature and nothing else. A good man's piety and virtue are not distinct possessions; they are himself, and all the glory which belongs to them, belongs to himself. What is religion? Not a foreign inhabitant, not something alien to our nature, which comes and takes up its abode in the soul. It is the soul itself, lifting itself up to its Maker. What is virtue? It is the soul, listening to, and revering, and obeying a law which belongs to its very essence, the law of duty. We sometimes smile when we hear men decrying human nature, and in the same breathing, exalting religion to the skies, as if religion were any thing more than human nature, acting in obedience to its chief law. Religion and virtue, as far as we possess them, are ourselves; and the homage which is paid to these attributes, is, in truth, a tribute to the soul of man. Self-crucifixion, then, should it exclude self-reverence, would be any thing but virtue.

We would briefly suggest another train of thought leading to the same result. Self-crucifixion, or self-renunciation, is a work, and a work requires an agent. By whom, then, is it accomplished? We answer, by the man himself, who is the subject of it. It is he who is summoned to the effort. He is called by a voice within, and by the law of God, to put forth power over himself, to rule his own spirit, to subdue every passion. Now

this inward power, which self-crucifixion supposes and demands, is the most signal proof of a high nature which can be given. It is the most illustrious power which God confers. It is a sovereignty worth more than that over outward nature. It is the chief constituent of the noblest order of virtues; and its greatness, of course, demonstrates the greatness of the human mind, which is perpetually bound and summoned to put it forth. But this is not all. Self-crucifixion has an object, an end; and what is it? Its great end, is, to give liberty and energy to our nature. Its aim is, not to break down the soul, but to curb those lusts and passions, "which war against the soul," that the moral and intellectual faculties may rise into new life, and may manifest their divine original. Self-crucifixion, justly viewed, is the suppression of the passions, that the power and progress of thought, and conscience, and pure love, may be unrestrained. It is the destruction of the brute, that the angel may unfold itself within. It is founded on our godlike capacities, and the expansion and glory of these is its end. Thus, the very duty, which, by some, is identified with self-contempt, implies and imposes self-reverence. It is the belief and the choice of perfection as our inheritance and our end.

We have thus shown, under what great limitations self-crucifixion, or self-renunciation, is to be understood, and how remote it is from self-contempt. Our purpose was, after closing this discussion, to give a rational interpretation of the phrases in which Fenelon has enjoined this duty. But our limits allow us just to glance at one or two of these. Perhaps he calls upon us to do nothing so often as "to renounce our own wills." This is a favourite phrase; and what does it imply? that we are to cease to will? Nothing less. The truth is, that the human will is never so strenuous as in this act, which is called the renunciation of itself, and by nothing does it more build up its own energy. The phrase means, that we should sacrifice inclination at the least suggestion of duty. But who does not know, that the mind never puts forth such strength of purpose or will as in overcoming desire? And what is the highest end and benefit of this warfare with desire? It is that the mind may accumulate force of moral purpose, that the will may more sternly, unconquerably resolve on the hardest duties, and sublimest virtues to which God may call us.

Once more, we are again and again exhorted by Fenelon to "forget ourselves." And what means this? Self-oblivion, literally understood, is an impossibility. We may as easily annihilate our being as our self-consciousness. Self-remembrance is, in truth, a duty, needful to the safety of every hour, and especially necessary to the great work of life, which is the conforming of ourselves, of our whole nature, to the will of God. There is no danger of our thinking of ourselves too much, if we will think justly; that is, if we will view ourselves as what we are, as moral beings, accountable to a divine lawgiver, framed to delight in and to seek virtue, framed for an ever-spreading philanthropy, called to sympathise with, and to suffer for others, and through this

path to ascend to our Original. There are, however, senses in which we cannot too much forget ourselves. Our improvements of whatever kind, our good deeds, our virtues, whenever they are seized upon and magnified by self-love, or so recalled as to lift us above others, and to stifle that sense of deficiency and thirst for progress, by which alone we can be carried forward, these we cannot too earnestly drive from our thoughts. Our distinctions, whether of mind, body, or condition, when they minister to vanity or pride, weaken the consciousness of a common nature with the human race, narrow our sympathies, or deprave our judgments; these we cannot be too solicitous to forget. Our pleasures, when they are so exaggerated by the imagination as to distract and overwhelm the sense of duty, should be forced to quit their grasp on our minds. Such parts or constituents of ourselves we are to forget. Our moral, intellectual, immortal nature, we cannot remember too much. Under the consciousness of it, we are always to live.

According to the views now given, self-crucifixion is the subjection or sacrifice of the inferior to the higher principles of our nature. It is the practical recognition of the supremacy and dignity of our rational and moral powers. No duty involves a more reverential view and care of ourselves. We have been the more solicitous to give this view of self-renunciation, because its true spirit is often mistaken, because it is often so set forth as to deject, instead of exalting the mind. In truth, we feel more and more the importance of bringing men to juster conceptions of the inward gifts with which God has enriched them. We desire nothing so much, as to open their eyes to their own spiritual possessions. We feel, indeed, the difficulties of the subject. We know that we have to combat with a secret incredulity in many minds. We know, that the clearest expositions will be imperfectly understood by those, who have nothing in their experience to interpret what we utter. The mind, we are aware, can be clearly revealed to itself, only by its own progress. Its capacities of thought, of action, of endurance, of triumphing over pleasure and pain, of identifying itself with other beings, of seeking truth without prejudice and without fear, of uniting itself with God, of sacrificing life to duty, these immortal energies can only be felt to be real, and duly honoured, by those in whom they are gradually and steadily unfolded. Still we do not despair of meeting some response, though faint, in multitudes. Such a spirit as God has breathed into men, cannot easily exist, without giving some signs of its divine original. In most men, there are some revelations of their own nature, some beams of a light which belongs not to the earth, some sympathies with what is good and great in character, some perceptions of beauty, some gushings from the deep fountain of love in the soul, some thirstings for a purer happiness, some experience of the peculiar joy of a disinterested deed, some dim conceptions at least of their intimate relations to God. Most men understand, through experience, these testimonies to the secret wealth and immortal destination of the soul; whilst, in not a few, such a measure of intellectual and moral power has been called forth, that nothing is needed but

a wise direction of their thoughts upon themselves, to open to them the magnificent prospect of their own spiritual energy, and of the unbounded good into which it may be unfolded. For such we have written. We regard nothing so important to a human being, as the knowledge of his own mind, and of its intimate connexion with the Infinite Mind. Faith, in what man contains as a germ in his own breast, faith in what he may become, in what he was framed to be, in that state of power, light, purity, joy, to which Jesus Christ came to exalt him, this faith seems to us the quickening, saving, renovating principle, which God sent his Son to revive in the soul, and happy are they who can spread its empire in the world.

(To be concluded in our next.)

On the Co-operative System.

(Continued from page 318.)

In the first place, the love of money, which is "the root of all evil," would be banished from the heart, and give place to the laudable ambition of employing our talents for the public good.

It is in vain for the moralist, or the divine, to inculcate the principles of benevolence into the minds of his hearers, to speak of the baneful effects of avarice, and the solemn denunciations of Christ and his Apostles, against that mean and degrading vice. His efforts will almost invariably prove nugatory.* The comforts which are supposed to accompany a state of affluence—the disadvantages which the poor labour under—the miseries which we know are felt by those who have been brought down from the pinnacle of prosperity, to the abyss of penury; and above all, the mere habit of acquiring property from our infancy upwards, will be more than sufficient to counteract the best exertions of the teacher of truth and righteousness.† In fact, owing to the present state of things,

* While I would not, for one moment, disparage public instruction, yet it may not be improper to question the sincere teachers of our holy religion, whether they would not be conferring a greater blessing upon their hearers, by establishing a community of goods, which would remove temptations out of the way of the thoughtless and inexperienced part of mankind, than to merely instruct them in their duty to God and their fellow-creatures? Especially, too, when ministers of every denomination are continually complaining, that the people pay but little attention to their admonitions, and that their preaching is vain and unprofitable to their respective congregations.

† If the Scriptures were read with more attention by the zealots of the present age, and if they produced in them the fruits of well-doing, they

selfishness is engendered in the human breast. The miseries of our fellow-creatures are either viewed with indifference, or thought of little consequence, when put in competition with our own immediate gratification; and that tender sensibility which exalts us above the beasts of the field, and makes our nature half divine, is obliged to yield to the prudential feelings of avarice. Even the well disposed man is frequently obliged to shut his ears against the pleadings of charity, lest by becoming benevolent he should become unjust, lest by benefiting mankind he should injure his family and connections.* On the contrary, it is evident, that in co-operative societies, these degrading and unholy feelings must be unknown. Every member is free from corroding selfishness, and his heart burns with a desire of communicating happiness to others.

---

would be struck with the solemn denunciations of our Lord, against the love of money, and be ashamed of grasping at wealth as the one thing needful.

"I have no wish," says a sensible writer, "to cast an unmerited imputation upon the characters of those religious teachers, who are accustomed to express themselves in a manner so unfriendly to the social recreations or pursuits of men; but I do say, that we are entitled to expect from them, an example of consistency in matters of this kind. Let them, then, show their contempt for the world, with its vain attractions, by avoiding all competition for its honours and distinctions; by not coveting ecclesiastical preferment; and by refusing those rich benefices, which are the objects of ambition to so many. Let them endeavour to lighten the pressure, and prevent the abuse of that law which compels the industrious peasant to give up a tenth part of the produce of his labour and his field, to augment the luxuries of his spiritual directors. Let them give up those superfluous livings, the duties of which they never can and never expect to discharge, that they may administer to the wants of a numerous, indigent, and yet industrious class of their clerical brethren, the labours and cares of whose pastoral offices are too intimately connected with the fear of domestic want, and the demands of an ill-fed family. Let them do this; but not until then, they may persuade us that they have no attachment to *the things that are in the world*. Of such personal sacrifices, however, I have never yet met with an example, even among those who profess themselves the greatest enemies of all worldly gratifications and distinctions."

I must add, that I am persuaded that the primitive Christians established a community of goods, because they were sure that every other state of society would cause the deceitfulness of riches to spring up and choke the Word of God.

* The following judicious reflections of Theodore Elbert, a young Swede, on the money-getting rage of the people of England, justify my remarks on this great impediment to virtue.

"Wealth, wealth, wealth. Praise be to the god of the nineteenth century—the golden idol, the mighty Mammon! Such are the accents of the time, such the cry of the nation. There never was an age when money could accomplish so much, as now in England. There may, here and there, be an individual who does not spend his heart in labour-

His days are employed in devising and executing schemes for the public good; and he finds by continued experience,

---

ing for riches, but there is nothing approaching to a class of persons, actuated by any other desire. To rest contented with poverty, demands more courage in any man, than would furnish forth a score of martyrs, or a hundred heroes. He who would attempt to make the improvement of his own nature, and of his age, the business of his life, and, therefore, to remain satisfied with a spare and unostentatious subsistence, is railed at as one knowing nothing of the true objects of existence, a useless and contemptible being, to be treated with haughtiness by every gambler in the funds—by every man whose soul is put out at compound interest, whose very being is garnered in a money chest by every owner of hereditary acres, and oracle of hereditary wisdom. To succeed in life, is to make a large fortune, without doing any thing which would send a man to prison! To be unsuccessful, is not the being ignorant, or luxurious, or envious, or sensual, but simply the being poor—the one unpardonable sin, not against the spirit of God, but against the spirit of the world! In England, the poor man walks surrounded with an atmosphere of shame. He lives upon the bitter crumbs of insolence, which fall from the rich man's table, and the common air of social humanity reaches him only in pinching blasts. Wherefore is this? It is a dark engrained spot in the national mind. It is a propensity which every good man must oppose, and which, if the country were in a healthy state, could never have grown upon it. But, as like every thing else, it must have its cause or causes, it would be well worth while to discover them. The chief of them seems to be, the nature of the government, which is founded half on privilege, and half on wealth. But the wealth can buy the privilege, and with it, therefore, is ultimately lodged the whole political power of England. The government is a chrysocracy; not that form of polity in which power is adapted to property, and the greatest mass of property has the chief dominion in the commonwealth, but that in which a small number of the richest individuals retain in their own hands the whole energies of the state. The law of succession in England, which gives the whole landed property to the eldest son, has set the fashion with regard to other property, and it is the ambition of every man who can obtain a large fortune, to transmit it undiminished to some one of his family. These great inheritances become the standards by which opinion measures wealth, and as society is not parcelled out by any impassable barriers, there is a perpetual struggle upwards, from step to step, in the scale of riches, and of, consequently, estimation, which concentrates the whole mind, and every feeling of the country, into the voracity for gain. Power, rank, political influence, all the most splendid objects of human eagerness, are, to an Englishman, comprised in wealth; and what is there of wonder that the talents, and industry, and enterprise of the country, all that should be instruments of good, are directed to this one pursuit?

Why does not a prophet arise from among this great people to lament over them, as did the seers of Judah over their degraded country;—to tell them of their lapses and their wanderings, and to exhibit in mighty and terrible visions the judgments which wait upon the doings of nations? Yet, would the voice of Isaiah be listened to on the Stock Exchange; or the pampered heart of aristocracy, tremble at the accents of Ezekiel? No: there are men who could accomplish this work, if it were to be done on a sudden. But this may not be. A *change of institutions* is necessary; and this change cannot take place without an alteration in the mind of the country. To this reform of thoughts and feeling it is not likely that England will arrive, until she has been taught by much sorrow—been disciplined into wisdom by suffering, and learned to listen to the voice of enlightened teachers."

that it is more blessed to give than to receive.* He at length perceives, that in pursuing his own advantage he must promote the welfare of his fellow beings; that the selfishness which seeks its own gratification at the expense of another's happiness, must defeat itself; that he only can obtain genuine success in the struggle of life, who acts on the principle that it is an interchange of kind and liberal offices, which scorns to rise by attempting another's fall, and who can taste no sweetness in the bliss which is purchased by another's woe. He still labours to promote his own individual advantage; but the competitors are liberal and enlightened, and the contest is generous and praiseworthy. It is philosopher contending with philosopher, patriot with patriot, and philanthropist with philanthropist. How, indeed, in such circumstances, is it possible that the mind of man should be tormented with worldly anxiety?† What motive can possibly induce him to hoard riches, when he can neither exclusively derive benefit from their possession, or portion them to his friends and relations? Thus would the greatest impediment to virtue and true religion,‡ be banished from the earth; and

* "To be convinced," says Dr. Enfield, "how much greater happiness arises even in the immediate act, independently of all remote consequences, from bestowing than from receiving a kindness, imagine the case of an afflicted house, where a widowed mother and her infant train are struggling with the complicated misery of lost comfort, disappointed hope, oppressive sickness, and threatening want. Conceive the widow and fatherless visited in this hour of distress by some kind and generous benefactor, who knows how to soothe their sorrows by the gentle accents of condolence, and who, with a judicious hand, pours the balm of consolation into the wounded heart, by bestowing, with all the delicacy of a generous sympathy, a seasonable and liberal supply. While you rejoice with the objects of his bounty, say, do you not envy the feelings of him who has caused the widow's heart to dance with joy? When you see him quitting the gloomy habitation, through which his beneficence has darted a transient gleam of joy, with a countenance sweetened with benevolence, and illumined with the consciousness of having been the minister of consolation to the wretched; can you avoid exclaiming—'How much more blessed is it to give than to receive.'"

† The life of man is frequently shortened by anxiety; and if we knew the private lives of thousands, we should find that the cares of this world and the evils of poverty, have often deprived wives of their husbands and made many children fatherless. It will therefore be found, that he who is the means of abolishing an oppressive tax, upon the industry of the hard working labourer, and supports those institutions and laws which allow him to reap the reward of his toil, does more towards the improvement of a nation's morals and a nation's permanent happiness, than by the distribution of thousands of unintelligible tracts, or whole hecatombs of ostentatious charity, or showers of sympathetic tears.

‡ I will venture to say, that the votaries of fashion and of avarice (often misnamed prudence) are the greatest stumbling-blocks to the

avarice and her attendant demons, no longer suffered to corrupt the human understanding, if co-operative societies were to become universal; and men would learn their best interest, by living with their fellow-creatures as brethren, and not as rivals or competitors in the love of gold. Rest assured, the path which leads to the temple of Plutus, is scattered with thorns; and should we find admittance at the altar of the god of our idolatry, he will only repay our labour by requiring us to forsake our best friends—contentment, piety, and charity.

But, secondly, The communion of goods would give every man an opportunity of improving his mind.

God has thought proper, in his infinite goodness, to endow man with reasoning faculties, which he must employ for his moral and intellectual improvement, if he would fulfil the design of his existence, and be truly happy. In proportion as these are neglected, his nature becomes degraded;* and the good actions which he may occasionally perform, are more the result of accident, than of any other cause. But owing, unfortunately, to the great inequality of mankind, and the misgovernment of every nation in the world, the by far greater portion of our fellow-creatures are enveloped in the darkness of ignorance. Without speaking of the frivolous pursuits† of so many of the higher classes, and their almost total neglect of *useful* knowledge,‡ how distressing is the condition of the poor in this and every other country in Europe? The capital evil (to use the words of that Christian philosopher, Dr.

exertions of the philanthropist in every great and good cause. They stood in the way of the primitive Christians; and the members of every public institution, whether civil or religious, are continually assailed by their quibbles and objections.

* The close connexion between knowledge and morals has been admitted and proved by the ablest sages of ancient and modern times.

† We are apt to condemn the pursuits and recreations of the poor; but those who are acquainted with the lives of the privileged higher orders, will confess that their conversation is often without meaning and their days devoted to the most idle amusements.

‡ The little which is taught in our boarding-schools is really useless. The taste is cultivated at the expense of the judgement; and the sciences, political economy, and other important qualifications, which are so necessary for our noblemen and statesmen, are obliged to give place to an ornamental and polished education. Our young ladies, too, instead of directing their attention to those pursuits which would enlarge their minds, and make them more suitable companions for their future husbands, and better calculated to manage a family or educate the rising generation, are now accustomed to devote five or six hours a-day to music, drawing, and other elegant accomplishments which polish the mind, but leave it naked and destitute of ideas.

Southwood Smith) under which they suffer, and the great source of every other, is, ignorance. Those only whom philanthropy or piety has induced to mix with them, in order to ascertain their state, and to improve it, have any adequate conception of its extent. These benevolent persons know, and these alone really know, that, to unexercised minds, the whole creation, and all its wonders and beauties, are a blank; that of these unhappy people, it is literally true, that they have eyes, but they see not, and understanding, but they perceive not; that the most magnificent appearances in nature, produce on them no impression; that events the most momentous, affecting for ages the destiny of their whole race, excites in them no emotion; that subjects the most important, involving their own highest happiness for life, and for immortality, create in them no interest; that the vacuity of their minds is all but absolute; that this absence of any thing that approximates to an intellectual conception, regards alike the most common circumstances, out of the routine of their ordinary occupations, and the truths which it concerns them most to know. Yet there is abundant evidence, that the minds of those in the lowest station might be awakened, their noblest faculties developed, and their highest improvement secured. BARNABAS.

(To be Continued.)

THE CHRISTIAN PIONEER.

GLASGOW, *July* 1, 1829.

THE Anniversary of the British & Foreign Unitarian Association was held in London, on the 10th of June. The Rev. Dr. Drummond of Dublin, preached the sermon at Finsbury Chapel, in the morning. In the afternoon, about three hundred gentlemen sat down to dinner at the London Tavern, John Wood, Esq. M. P. Chairman. It appears to have been a highly interesting meeting. Many excellent remarks were made by various highly respected individuals, but our limits will only allow of the insertion of the following:—On the health of Dr. Drummond being proposed, with thanks to him for his forcible, convincing, and eloquent discourse, the Doctor observed,

That no expressions of his could do justice to the sentiments which had been inspired by the very kind manner in which his

health had been drank. He had come a stranger amongst them, but he had found himself at home, in the midst of friends and brethren, so that this formed one of the happiest days of his life, and one to which he should always recur with feelings of the most pleasing description. He was proud of the honour which had been done to him, not on his own account, but for reasons of a more serious and important nature. He considered the invitation which he had received from the Unitarians of England, as an expression of their desire to secure a more enlarged intercourse with the Unitarians of Ireland. He felt assured, that the chain of love which they had now formed, would become strong and indissoluble; and that they would unite their energies to emancipate the minds of men, and thus secure their real liberties. Dr. Drummond then adverted to the advantages which the Unitarians of Ireland must derive from an intercourse with those in this country, and who were so far advanced beyond them in intellectual character. It was only of late years, he remarked, that Unitarians had been recognised in Ireland; the greatest prejudices had been excited against them, from the episcopal throne down to the reading desk. Hence they were exposed to the contumely and insults of every description of fanatics and enthusiasts. There were others, again, whose connexions prevented them from avowing principles, of the truth of which they were partly convinced; and some few, who, from higher motives, had abstained from professing them. He felt happy, however, that prejudices were giving way, and that a brighter prospect was opening before the Unitarians of Ireland. It had been asserted, that it would be beneficial for all men to stand on common ground: it might be so; but he would urge it upon Unitarians, to bend all their efforts to the establishment of their grand fundamental principles; if that were effected, every thing else would follow. The cause of truth in Ireland, was much indebted to the efforts of its enemies. Some members of the Synod of Ulster had been anxious to impose the rusty iron yoke of Calvinism; and their exertions to effect this, had awakened others from their slumbers, to the defence of their liberties. The thunders of orthodoxy and bigotry had been rocking long and loud, and they had raised a spirit of resistance, which it would be found impossible to lay. Their spell was now broken—their charm was dissolved, and the black clouds in which they were enveloped, were rapidly rolling away. He trusted, they would soon witness the commencement of a new, a bright, and a glorious day of knowledge and religion.

The Chairman rose and said, that their obligations were very great to the ministers of the denomination, but there were some laymen to whom their thanks were due. They were honoured with the presence of a gentleman who had been the first to acknowledge the Unitarians in Parliament, and whose uniform consistency of conduct, both in public and private life, had conferred a distinction on their cause which they would long have wanted, but for him. True it was, that their only real respectability was founded on the truth of their principles, yet it was of consequence that truth should have an eloquent, consistent, and

firm supporter in a place where it was but little known. After taking a very able review of his public life, in which he referred particularly to his exertions in obtaining the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, he proposed, "The health of William Smith, Esq. M. P. our distinguished guest."

Mr. W. Smith, M. P. said, that, in rising to thank the meeting for the manner in which they had been pleased to drink his health, he could not say that he was placed in a situation to which he was unaccustomed, having been honoured more than once by presiding over similar meetings to the present, but on no occasion did he enjoy more satisfaction in receiving the tokens of their approbation; as to gratitude, he must declare with the most unfeigned humility, that they owed him none. It was his happiness to have been brought up among Unitarian Dissenters. Whether he had supported the Unitarian cause with more or less success, it was always done in accordance with the dictates of his judgment, and he was therefore serving his own cause, while promoting that of his Unitarian friends. If any thing remained to be done in which he could be of service, those services were always at the command of his friends. While he continued to hold the same opinion, he should pursue the same line of conduct. He considered himself as being peculiarly fortunate in those days in which Providence had cast his lot. He commenced public life when unquestionably the temper of the times was very different from what it was at the present day. For a time, he had to pass through evil and through good report, though he had to experience a great deal more of the former than of the latter. He possessed courage enough to stem the evil, and he had now the happiness to receive the good. He could not refrain from recalling to the meeting, what he had witnessed in the course of the last fifty years. He remembered the period when it devolved upon him to march through the streets of London with a musket on his shoulder, in order to support his fellow-citizens, the Roman Catholics, against the pulling down of their dwellings, and the burning of their furniture, by an infuriated Protestant (so calling itself) mob. About thirty years after that period, and within a quarter of a mile of this place, he witnessed the consecration of a Roman Catholic Chapel, the ceremony of which, was attended by the magistrates of the city of London, and several peers of the realm, both Protestant and Catholic. In conjunction with several gentlemen, whom he was then addressing, he adjourned from that scene to a neighbouring tavern, where they celebrated their good cause, and paid the tribute due to those that ministered to their instruction in the morning, separated only by one door from their Roman Catholic friends, who had just arrived to rejoice in the opening of the chapel. He had lived to see Dissenters restored in one year, to the enjoyment of those privileges of which they had been deprived 150 years before. He had lived to see Protestant Dissenters acknowledged among the loyal subjects of the realm, and restored to that station which, for forty years, he had argued their right to occupy. He now had the additional satisfaction of witnessing the triumph of civil and religious liberty, and almost every

person put in possession of its enjoyment. That was a consummation, which, however devoutly he might wish for, he never expected to see realised. He agreed with the sentiment uttered that evening, that this event would confer more honour upon George the Fourth, than all the victories which had been obtained over surrounding nations. He hoped that Protestant Dissenters would now consider themselves so far upon a level, as not to break in upon the good fellowship in which they ought to regard their neighbours. With respect to the marriage bill, he sincerely trusted that measure would be carried unanimously during the next Session of Parliament. From the Prime Minister an assurance had been given, that whatever interval was allowed him before the next Session, should be employed in removing those scruples that remained in the minds of others; so that there might be removed from Unitarians, the last badge of degradation under which they laboured. He understood that one of the brethren from the new Continent was present that evening—a country to which England was bound not merely by the ties of language, but of government, and in the enjoyment of all the blessings of Civil and Religious Liberty.

The healths of the Rev. Robert Aspland and the other Secretaries of the Association, having been received with loud plaudits, Mr. Aspland said—

The present were extraordinary times, and he must advert to the topic to which all the previous speakers had alluded, namely, the march of religious liberty. He could do so in character, because if one sect had understood and acted upon the principles of civil and religious liberty more than another, that sect, even by the confession of their enemies, were Unitarians. That sect had always maintained the great principle, that no man had a right to dictate to the conscience of another, or to make his temporal privileges the less on account of his religious opinions. Members of Parliament had never meditated an act for the relief of oppressed consciences, without looking to the Unitarians for support. There must be a cause for such a procedure, and he humbly suggested that it arose from the fact, that the Unitarians had caught the true spirit of religious liberty. It might be, that Unitarians had always been anxious to imitate the conduct of the good Samaritan towards the Jew. It would be presumption for him to say, that the late measures for the relief of the Protestant Dissenters, and the Roman Catholics, had been owing to the Unitarian Association; but he would say, that according to their strength and opportunity, their sickles had not been idle in the harvest. With a serious determination they had entered the field early and late, and had cheered on their fellow-labourers in the cause. Unitarians felt the sincerest joy at recollecting, that in all they had done they had not been actuated by a sectarian regard to themselves, but a regard to the welfare of all men. Why had Unitarians always been selected by certain individuals in both Houses of Parliament, as the subjects of reproach? Because they were the first persons to raise their voices in the sacred cause of liberty.

Why had the Roman Catholics always looked to Unitarians, to whose principles they were so diametrically opposed? However much Catholics doubted the support of other bodies of Dissenters, they always counted upon the votes of the Unitarians, as a matter of course. There were persons from whose hearts "the black drop" of bigotry had never been extracted; who learned nothing, whilst the rest of the world were improving; who do not belong to this age, but seem "born out of due time." A pamphlet had been written by a popular minister in London, against the Unitarians, warning the religious world against them, and calling upon those who professed orthodoxy to come out from amongst them, they having signalised themselves as the friends of the Catholics. He once heard a minister gravely assert, that the friends of the Catholic relief bill, were giving their strength to the beast! One word more, and he spoke it with sorrow; the successful efforts which the Unitarians had made for the relief of the Catholics, had given rise to an attempt to divide them from the three great bodies of Dissenters in London, in order that the vile might be separated from the holy, and the chaff from the wheat! A meeting of the *Baptist* ministers was held to discuss the question, "Whether they should not separate from the general body, on account of that body being contaminated by Unitarians?" The motion was made and seconded, and he (Mr. Aspland) was glad to say, upon the authority of a respectable Baptist minister, that after a warm debate, which continued for upwards of two hours, the mover and seconder begged to withdraw the motion. That leave was given, and bigotry in the denomination was consigned to oblivion. Within a few days of the present period, a similar question was to be agitated among the *Independents*. Regular notice had been given, and the discussion must consequently come on. Some of the leading ministers in that denomination, than whom truer friends to the cause of liberty never breathed, had told him with great concern, that they never expected to witness such a proceeding; and that if the object was carried into effect, they, at least, would never separate themselves from the body. These were clouds returning after the rain—a few passing showers. They might for a moment obscure the day of liberty, but it was only that it might shine forth with the greater splendour. From the spirit and temper evinced by the Chairman that day, he trusted that his assistance would be received by the Unitarians, until they had gained complete success. From the statements made that evening, he sincerely hoped that the marriage bill would be carried during the ensuing session of Parliament. Mr. Peel had devoted himself to the cause of civil and religious liberty—Wellington, who had been accustomed to cut his way through with a sword, had expressed his horror of a civil war—another of the ministers, also a "great Captain," had read a lecture to the clergy on religious peace and charity; all which circumstances, assured him that the marriage bill would be passed into a law. He was sure that when the measure was again discussed, it would be seen that the Church of England was dishonoured by the violence done to the consciences of the Unitarians. Mr. Aspland, after

expressing his concurrence in what had been said respecting their departed friends, observed, with regard to the Association, that he anticipated the time when its services would be no longer required. When Unitarianism and Trinitarianism would be merged in the better and nobler name of Christianity, the true millenium would commence; not the millenium after which fanatics had been seeking in their mystic dreams—but that happy state in which all men would regard each other as equals, and all men would look up to the great and merciful Being as the common Father of the human race.

Dr. Bowring said, he rose with apprehension when he had to follow his eloquent friend, but he would venture to take to himself some portion of the kind sentiments with which the Institution had honoured its secretaries. He had to report to those present at Finsbury Chapel in the morning, the foreign history of the Association, during the past year. He then had to state, that the Association had met with many subjects of difficulties and of rejoicing; but he would now venture to call the attention of the company to a topic of unmingled delight and joy, namely, the position of the Unitarian cause in America. The Association had that day received a gentleman (Rev. Henry Ware) who had been delegated to state the feelings of their friends on the other side of the Atlantic; and he (Dr. B.) was sure that the hands of hundreds would be stretched out to him (Mr. Ware) in cordial welcome. Whatever the Unitarians might have to depress and distress them in the East, on the other side of the great ocean, they had nothing to look upon but topics of encouragement and gratulation. There the cause of truth was making great and glorious progress. From year to year as the Association met together, they gathered evidence the most irresistible and conclusive, that whatever they might meet of discouragement in the Eastern world, they had there every thing to animate them in their exertions. The great cause of liberality and of truth, when embarked on its Transatlantic voyage, had reached its port of security. He was sure he spoke the feelings of the Unitarian Association, when he said to his friend (Mr. W.) that the individual who united Unitarians in this country in stronger bonds to those on the other side of the water, would be deemed worthy of all honour; while Unitarians would deprecate and disdain the man who planted any one seed of discord or disaffection between them. He was quite sure there was no individual in that company, who did not look to America, both in its moral and intellectual greatness, with delight and triumph. If they had been our children in the period of their weakness, they were our brothers now in the hour of their strength. He considered the presence of Mr. Ware on this occasion, as one of the most interesting events that had ever occurred in the history of the Unitarian Association. In connection with our progress and our history in America, I cannot (said Dr. B.) avoid referring to that splendid writer and high-souled man, whose services to literature have been of the highest order, and whose career is marked by a series of pure and beautiful triumphs; whether he unveiled the gentle, the generous, the judicious Fenelon

to the stronger admiration and more correct estimate of mankind, or elevated yet higher our Milton, our own British poet—he whose mind the mind of Channing most resembled—he whose soul is like a star and dwells apart,

> Who had a voice whose sound was like the sea,
> Pure as the naked heaven!

But most of all, and first of all, do I honour Dr. Channing, for dethroning from the affections of men that modern conqueror—the mysterious but magnificent delusions of whose name, I look upon as the fruitful source of error and of misery—that man whose history is one of usurpation and violence—the warrior—the aggressor—of whom a poor but energetic poet has truly said,

> "He built on multitudinous graves
> A tyrant's power, and sought to bind with cords,
> Thought—for she flapped him with her wing of words
> Which agitateth nations."

For this good deed, as a Christian and a lover of peace, for this especially I thank Dr. Channing. He has attacked successfully a fallacy, of all fallacies the most pernicious, and it wanted a vigorous arm like his to smite so huge an idol. Dr. B. regretted that the broken state of Mr. Ware's health compelled him to deny himself the pleasure of addressing the company. From this satisfaction he was absolutely and peremptorily debarred, but as he had commissioned Mr. Taylor to communicate his sentiments, he (Dr. B.) would propose—"The health—the improved and perfect health of Mr. Ware, with our friendly greetings to the American Association, and our best wishes for their happiness and success."

A paper was read from Mr. Ware, which expressed briefly the gratification which he felt in meeting this body of his brethren in the land of his fathers, and in bearing to them the message of sympathy and good will across the waters. There existed on both sides the Atlantic, a desire for better acquaintance, and a need for mutual countenance and aid; and he trusted that something might result to the benefit of all, from the present fraternal intercourse. As they proposed to have "one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all," and to be engaged in one common object, the emancipation of men from error and sin, so they ought more and more to feel and act as brethren. He offered them the congratulations of the American people, on the recent triumphs of civil and religious liberty, and gave a brief sketch of the measures which are pursuing in America, and the state of religious parties there. He spoke particularly of the successful operations of the American Unitarian Association, in providing religious instruction for the destitute poor of Boston, and of the growing interest throughout the community, in the cause of religious education. He concluded by acknowledging the kindness with which he had been welcomed to England, and saying, that as by a singular coincidence the two Associations were formed on the same day of the same year, he would regard it as an omen that they would go on their way together, joined heart and hand in a zealous, affectionate, and holy co-operation.

The Chairman having proposed the health of Lord Holland, and the Members of both Houses of Parliament who profess the true and full doctrine of Religious Liberty, the Rev. W. J. Fox, observed—

That nothing but the direct and irresistible appeal which had been made to him by the Chairman, would have induced him to address the meeting. He had been involuntarily absent two successive anniversaries of the Association. He had been in a state which one of his worthy friends had called "being buried alive," but he had been called upon in a trumpet voice to rise from it, and to the utmost of his power he would obey the call. With regard to the great change which had just been made in the laws of this country, he should confine himself to that portion of it which showed its connection with the proceedings of the present meeting, and the objects of the Institution. He regarded it not merely as a political triumph—not merely as the triumph of religious liberty; but, in his judgment, and in his conscience, he considered it as a Unitarian triumph. It had been said, that Unitarians were doing little. Whether this were true or not, their principles were doing much. He considered the passing of the Catholic Relief Bill, a Unitarian triumph, because it appeared to him that universal and unqualified religious liberty was one of the distinguishing and most glorious tenets and principles of Unitarians. He would appeal to facts in proof of his statement. Who were they that advocated the measure most consistently, that advocated the measure universally? Who were the foremost in the field? Who fired the first shot? He would reply, without fear of contradiction, the Unitarians of this country. Taking any statement which he had seen, it was an undeniable fact, that the great majority were the petitions of the Unitarians. Here then he saw Unitarian principles advancing the cause of freedom. Looking in another direction, he saw that if Unitarians were doing but little, their principles were doing much. He looked to the laws, and he watched, and watched with delight, as every friend to human kind in this country must, the progress which was making towards the simplification of the modes of legal procedure, towards the prevention of crime, and the reformation of criminals; and what was that but the application of the great Unitarian principle, that the proper end of punishment was not revenge but correction? As the state of society advanced, the theological opinions which corresponded with it must advance also. When laws became more righteous and more merciful—when the courts of law admitted of procedure consistent with common sense—then must men be weaned from a theology, which by the imputation of righteousness and guilt, held out a more monstrous absurdity than the worst legal fictions of our law courts in the worst of times—then would men be weaned from a belief that the wise and merciful God punished vindictively as to the principle, and eternally as to the duration. He would say again, that if Unitarians were doing little, their principles were doing much. He now particularly alluded to the spread of knowledge

and education. When he heard of the "march of intellect," he rejoiced therein, for what was intellect but a herald to prepare the way, and to make a strait and broad path for the triumphal chariot of pure religion? It had been said, that the schoolmaster was abroad, he rejoiced therein, for the schoolmaster was neither more nor less than a Unitarian missionary. When he found rival colleges about to rear their heads in the Metropolis, he rejoiced therein. Let them rear their heads ever so proudly, if men were there taught scientific truths, and the principles of sound logic, those two rising institutions would but be pillars of the porch of a Unitarian temple. Let Bible Societies send forth the Bible, let Missionary Societies send forth their Missionaries to the ends of the earth; he rejoiced in their success; for that which led men to the knowledge of God and to its study, must make known the principles of the Word of God, which were the principles of Unitarians. He felt from his heart the kindness with which the company had welcomed him after his absence. He looked upon that absence as presenting to him an additional stimulus to propagate the true principles of Christianity—those principles which not only seemed powerful and glorious in the season of social communication and excitement, but preserved all their lustre in the time of sickness and solitude; which were not only a panoply of proof for the conflicts of controversy, but a staff of support for the tottering steps of infancy and age; which, when our way of life was in the night and through the wilderness, were a pillar of fire for our guidance; and which took their stand like the angel at the tomb, pointing from the dust to heaven, and declaring a resurrection.

TO CORRESPONDENTS AND SUBSCRIBERS.

Dialogues on Religion, No. 5,—The Unitarian, No. 5,—G. C. S. have been received.

The Title Page and Index to the Third Volume, will be given with the next Number.

Each individual Subscriber to the CHRISTIAN PIONEER, is earnestly requested to use his exertions and influence in procuring ONE *additional Subscriber*. If this be done, the permanence of the Magazine would be secured, and, it is hoped, the progress of Christian liberality advanced. The first Number of the *Fourth Volume*, will be published on the 1st of September.

THE

CHRISTIAN PIONEER.

No. 36. AUGUST, 1829. Vol. III.

On the Principles and Evidences of Christianity.

LETTER IX. and Last.

General View of the Evidence of the Resurrection of Jesus to Immortality.

FROM the view which we have taken of the particulars recorded concerning the death and resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ, it appears that his whole person became inanimate in the grave, from whence he was both restored to life and transformed to a superior and immortal state. Nothing can appear more evident, than the entire sympathy which subsisted between his corporeal, vital, and mental powers. When the body became inanimate, the whole person was inanimate; no symptoms whatever were given of any species of vital or conscious existence; and, accordingly, his disciples, not in the least degree anticipating his speedy return to life, sunk into despondency, and gave their attention to no object beyond that of affording him an honourable interment. No indications were presented, either to his friends or his enemies, of the existence of any powers, human, divine, or superangelic, appertaining to him, during this interval. The dead body alone engaged their attention; and his enemies were intent on no other object, than that of retaining it in the sepulchre, till the fourth day from his crucifixion, that thus they might disprove his predictions, and evince the fallacy of his pretensions. And had it remained inanimate, his authority as the Messiah, "the Prince of Life," could never have been established; his Apostles could not have announced him to the world in that character; they could not have "preached through him, the resurrection from the dead;" the great object and purport of the Gospel—that of "abolishing death," and of "bringing life and immortality to light"—would not have been accomplished; and since all the evidence would have gone to disprove his conscious existence, his pretensions as the Messiah must have been abandoned, and his kingdom and

power could never have been realized, either in this world or in a future existence.

Thus, the whole purport, design, and influence of Christianity, rests on the fact of the revival of the body of Jesus: nor would its simple revival have answered the purpose, without its translation to a state of immortality. There would still have been no evidence of this great and glorious event; it was in its complete transition from inanimation to a spiritual and immortal state, in which he became associated with celestial spirits, that a specimen was afforded of a like state of existence to all his followers, and, with certain modifications, apportioned to their respective merits or demerits, to the whole human race.

From the moment, therefore, of the disappearance of the body from the sepulchre, every circumstance indicates that he is not only living, but elevated in the sphere of existence above that of ordinary humanity. An angel descending from heaven is his deliverer; and eluding the vigilance of the watchmen, he passes into that state of invisibility from which the angel had proceeded. He now appears to be the companion of celestial spirits; they are the attendants on his movements, and, like them, he undergoes transitions from an invisible to this visible state, and *vice versa*. He occasionally assumes precisely the same bodily form and appearance, as previous to and even beyond the moment of his decease—exhibiting the wound in his side inflicted after that event, and which remaining, it was not only evident that his life was renewed, but, it is probable also, supported by a miracle. The whole evidence of his invisible existence, is effected by these corporeal manifestations from, and returns to, that state; and in each of those manifestations, the most palpable proofs are exhibited of his actual presence, as distinguished from any of those ideal images which are apt to arise in the minds of the living, on the recollection of their departed friends, and which have so often been mistaken for real external spirits or phantoms. In the last instance, after exhibiting himself again in the form of ordinary humanity, he proves, by his ascent toward the heavens, that he is gradually withdrawn from this visible to an invisible and heavenly state; the diminution of his specific gravity, necessarily attendant on his ascent, evincing not only his local removal, but the transition of his body to a state totally different from that of our present gross

bodies. Thus, every circumstance conduced to show that his whole person was both revived and translated to an immortal state, and that every change he underwent, was inseparably connected with that of his bodily frame.

His transition to the world of spirits, in consequence of the revival and translation of his body, was further evinced by his almost constant removal from the observation of his enemies, and of the world at large, from that time forward. Not only was he withdrawn invisibly from the sepulchre, but no traces of his body were afterwards discovered by them. Its total *disappearance* must have been to them a most unexpected as well as unsatisfactory circumstance. Unless they had received such evidence as they could not resist, that the mode of his removal and disappearance was miraculous, they would have commenced a strict scrutiny, in order to discover in what secret retreat the body had been deposited. If any reason had existed, to believe that he was living in the ordinary form of humanity, this also must have given rise to much searching and inquiry after his person, on the part of the Jewish people, from various motives. The multitudes who had ushered him into Jerusalem with hosannas, "wishing prosperity to him and his kingdom,"* as the Messiah, but who were shortly afterwards persuaded by their rulers to join in the cry for his crucifixion, would be deeply interested to know the result of his disappearance from the sepulchre; nor, probably, would any circumstance be more accordant with their expectations, than his appearance as the Messiah, "with great power and glory." That he should have become an invisible spirit, *in consequence* of his resurrection, would be contrary to their ideas and expectations in every point of view, and, therefore, would not easily obtain credit from them. No person, probably, had any previous idea of such a transition of an animal body to invisibility; and that the Messiah should exercise his authority in such a state, as the result of his resurrection, would be equally remote from their wishes and their expectations. It would appear to them a mass of improbabilities, alike incredible and revolting. They would, under these impressions, suspect some mistake or deception with respect to the removal of the body, and

---

* Whitby on Mat. xxi. 8. *Hosanna to the Son of David*, v. 9, is rendered by Cruden, "*Lord preserve the Son of David, this king.*"

would, therefore, be earnestly desirous of discovering his person, and of determining whether it were living or inanimate. Yet it has never been pretended, from the period of his resurrection to the present day, that they succeeded in making any discovery of this nature. All who acknowledged his authority, and they were numerous from the Jews in the first instance (though not in such bodies as to indicate, that it proceeded from that blind enthusiasm in favour of a Messiah, for which their national character has been so long distinguished), regarded him as a sovereign who had been withdrawn from the ordinary state of humanity, and had passed into the celestial state. He was, therefore, according to every fact that can be deduced from all descriptions of men, withdrawn from observation at the moment of his resurrection—an event which they would not have credited without much inquiry or powerful evidence; and, contrary as it was to the ideas and wishes of those especially who were prepared to acknowledge him as the Messiah, he was admitted to have been, from that period, translated to the world of invisible spirits.

Though the Jewish people in general, never saw Jesus from the period of his interment, yet they well knew that he had been put to death, and his body as effectually secured in the sepulchre, as human power and prudence could render it. They must soon have become acquainted with the fact, that these precautions had proved unavailing—that the body had disappeared, and the force and vigilance of the guards been completely frustrated: so that they had not only failed in their resistance, but were unable to give any account of the mode of his disappearance. As this extraordinary circumstance must have stimulated the inquiries of the people, for the purpose of obtaining satisfaction as to a result in which their past conduct was strongly implicated, and on which their eager expectations, with respect to his pretensions as the Messiah, depended, so from that day to the present, there never has appeared any other conclusion from those inquiries, than that the body was withdrawn from all human cognizance. A conclusion so singular, under circumstances in which the body or person of Jesus was, from various motives, so peculiarly in request by all parties, in which its disappearance was so unexpected, and in one point of view or another so disappointing to all, could only have proceeded from reality.

The body of Jesus had disappeared in a miraculous manner; it was absolutely withdrawn from all the powers of mortal inspection. The angelic appearances, recorded as having been alike unexpectedly exhibited at the sepulchre, furnish the clue for its explication. They came from the invisible state, in order to receive him into it; and from the period of his resurrection, and not before, he became "a quickening spirit," and the associate of beings of a celestial order.

The fact we are considering, *viz.* the transition of the body of Jesus, as identified with his person, from inanimation to an invisible and immortal state, was no less at variance with the opinions of the Gentiles, than of the Jews. If they had any belief of a future conscious existence, it was founded not on the renovated life, but the death of man—not on his bodily translation to an immortal state, but on a supposed separate existence of a vital principle: while his body, regarded as a mere clog or impediment to its active energies, the prison of the soul, was left to perish for ever. It could, therefore, only be by the force of palpable evidence, that such a doctrine would make progress among them. They would have the less inducement to give a serious attention to the representation, when the person who was asserted to have undergone this transition, was of low origin—distinguished by none of those martial achievements to which they appropriated the name of virtue, and by none of those splendid literary attainments which "immortalized" the names of some of their writers, but who terminated his career in this life, by a most ignominious death as a malefactor, with the concurrence of the Gentile authorities, and those of his own nation. And it must have added not a little to their incredulity, and their disposition to oppose the account, that this crucified Jew was not only said to have undergone this transition of his whole person to an immortal state, but to be invisibly exercising the authority of a sovereign, who should finally triumph over all human authorities, and establish a universal empire; being the appointed "King of kings, and Lord of lords,"—"the Lord both of the living and the dead." Such pretensions, unaccompanied by evidence which could not be gainsayed nor resisted, would draw down upon the disciples the marked ridicule and contempt of the Gentiles in general.

Now, miracles enabling timid and illiterate men, who

had no previous notions concerning such an event, to announce it with extraordinary courage and address, and even with fluency, in languages which they had never learned,* must have been admirably calculated to summon the general attention to their statement. In every instance in which so wonderful a miraculous influence could be ascertained, it could hardly fail of producing a conviction of the truth of the fact it was employed to announce and authenticate. At least, it is not possible to conceive of a miracle more calculated to bespeak the attention of men to the other miraculous proofs which the disciples of Jesus professed to perform. Miracles consisting in the removal of every malady to which the human frame is subjected,† and in occasionally restoring the vital powers after they had been suspended;‡ in some instances producing parts‖ and functions which had never before existed;§ and, on a few extraordinary occasions, withdrawing life or some of its faculties,¶ all wrought expressly in the name of Jesus, were no less adapted to evince his authority over the bodies and lives of men, and to show that the divine favour is exerted in healing, preserving, and restoring the bodily powers, and that their destruction is a mark of the divine displeasure. These were sensible means of bringing home to the judgment and feelings of men, the conclusion that their whole persons are under the care and blessing of the Almighty; that the framer of our bodies is no other than the father of our spirits, who has rendered their vigour and enjoyments mutual. The copious effusion of spiritual gifts was a species of miracle peculiarly suited to confirm the same principles. This would manifest that the same power, which gave soundness to the bodies, purified and exalted the spirits of men, and by their united influence gave anticipations of a period when both their bodies and spirits should be renewed—when all the evils appertaining to the former should be removed; and in consonance with the elevated character of the latter, should lose their "vile" properties, and become "glorified" and immortal.

The actual performance of such miracles, must have powerfully operated in the establishment of the great

* As we read at length, Acts ii. † Acts v. 15. xiv. 3.
‡ Acts ix. 36—42.
‖ Luke has not particularized this in his brief narrative, but see Matt. xv. 31.—Wakefield's translation.
§ Matt. xiv. 8—10. ¶ Acts v. 1—11. xiii. 11.

principles they were wrought to confirm. Being all performed expressly in the name of Jesus who was crucified, and who escaped from his sepulchre in opposition to the force, and eluding the vigilance of the Roman soldiers; they were so many proofs that his removal and disappearance were the result of a divine interposition, and that his whole person was translated to an invisible state, in which he was invested with all that authority which was ascribed to him. They were not only suited to prove a divine interposition in his favour, but that particular kind of interposition by which he had undergone this glorious transformation of every power, both corporeal and mental. And, together with it, they are particularly adapted to establish the general position, of a similar event to be extended to all his followers, and ultimately to the whole human race.

It is manifest that the profession to perform miracles so palpable to the senses, and which must have furnished such abundant opportunities for examination, had it not been founded in reality, would in all probability have effected the speedy overthrow of his pretensions. Had the illiterate Galileans *professed* to declare fluently in languages which they had never learned, a doctrine so odious and incredible to all parties to whom it was addressed, as that of the elevation to invisible and supreme authority, of the man, in whose crucifixion there had been so general a concurrence, how ineffectual must have been the attempt—how certainly must it have drawn upon them the ridicule and contempt it would in that case have deserved! The same remark equally applies to the case of the man well known in Jerusalem to have been lame from his birth;* and in general to all those miracles, by the reality of which alone these plain men were enabled to maintain their stand against the power, the malice, and acuteness of their enemies. Alike impossible must it have been for the Apostle Paul—whose epistles sufficiently evince that he determined to adhere strictly to the doctrine of the crucified Jesus, as the anointed of God, having been raised from death and elevated to celestial authority—to have gained credence to it among Gentiles, had the numerous miraculous powers, to which he appeals,† as existing in the societies

* Acts iii. 2.

† See particularly I Cor. xii. 4—11; and 28, 29. Gal. iii. 5. And Eph. iv. 11, 12.

and persons to whom he wrote, had no foundation but in imagination or pretence. Nothing but the reality of powers of healing—powers of speaking in unknown tongues, and of explaining ancient prophecies applicable to the Messiah and the progress of his doctrine, can account for the admission of these facts by the numerous bodies of Gentiles to whom his epistles are addressed, and in attestation of a doctrine which by their prejudices and interests they were so strongly inclined to disbelieve and oppose.

That the Christian religion did originate from Jesus who was crucified, and after making considerable progress among the Jews, and from the spot in which he suffered an ignominous death by the public authorities; and that it soon afterwards made great progress at Rome, and in many cities and districts of the Roman empire, is evinced by the concurring testimony of both its friends and its enemies;* who also concur in testifying that its adherents were exposed to severe punishments by the ruling authorities; the Jews, as a nation, maintaining their enmity against it, and the Roman powers endeavouring to crush it by a series of cruel persecutions; notwithstanding which, it continued to spread without any other means than the power of its evidences and the influence of its spirit, till in the third century from its introduction, it was embraced by the Roman Emperor, probably from mingled motives of conviction and of policy, and thus, in the language of an adversary, "the banners of the cross were erected on the ruins of the capitol." A doctrine which enjoins, on the authority of a crucified "Jewish peasant," that its votaries should "not resist evil, but overcome evil with good;" by their persisting to act on this principle, in the assured expectation, that, like their master, they should as the

* Tacitus Ann. Lib. xv. chap. 24, attests the spread of Christianity to Rome, shortly after the execution of Christ by Pilate, as a criminal; and the cruel persecution of Christians by Nero. Juvenal, in his 4th Sat. describes their sufferings in corresponding terms. Suetonius expressly mentions the same event, which happened about A. D. 64. Pliny, in his letter to Trajan, A. D. 107, testifies its spread, not in "cities only, but in the lesser towns and the open country;" that "the temples were almost forsaken," although he had succeeded, by the terrors of death, in causing them to be somewhat "more frequented." The subsequent progress of this religion, the persecutions of Domitian, Decius, and Dioclesian, and the success of Constantine in maintaining his authority unopposed by any heathen competitor, after the last most cruel attempt to extirpate Christianity, are facts of notoriety.

reward of their obedience, undergo a transformation from death to life and immortality, at length prevailed against the most violent and determined opposition, that was perhaps ever aimed at a body of men and the religion they had embraced. Could a doctrine so opposed to the principles, prejudices, and worldly interests of all parties at the period of its introduction, have made such progress by appeals to proofs of the most palpable description, and by the spirit of meekness in opposition to the most determined, powerful, and cruel hostility, by any other means but the reality of the principles and facts on which it was established? Could a system which obtained an influence at once so powerful and so salutary on the minds of its votaries, transforming them from "men of violence to quite another nature," be any other than divine? Had their discerning enemies been able to detect a fraud or a fallacy in their statements, by the exhibition of evidence or the force of reasoning, would they have grown so furious, and have opposed appeals to facts by torture and destruction, thus marshalling their powers against the unresisting? At length, finding attacks unsuccessful, would they have come over to their "standard," and when grown too powerful for their opposition, have affected to take them under their protection? This *protection*, indeed, has involved Christianity in the longest and most difficult struggles which it hath had to encounter; but the pure gold is gradually purifying itself from the alloy, and at length it will emerge from the embraces even of this insidious enemy.

HOMO.

The Character and Writings of Fenelon.

(Concluded from page 399.)

WE have finished our remarks on the first element of perfection, according to Fenelon, self-crucifixion. We proceed to the second, love to God. On this topic we intended to enlarge, but have left ourselves little room. We are happy to say, that we have less to object to Fenelon's expositions under this head, than under the former. Of the grandeur and the happiness of this principle, he speaks truly, worthily, in the penetrating language of calm and deep conviction. In one particular, we think him defective. He has not stated, and, in truth, very few do state with sufficient strength and precision, the moral foundation and the moral nature of religion. He has not taught with sufficient clearness, the great truth, that love to God is, from beginning to end, the love of virtue.

He did not sufficiently feel, that religion is the expansion and most perfect form of the moral faculty of man. He sometimes teaches, that, to do God's will, we must renounce ourselves and silence reason; as if the divine will were not in accordance with our faculties; as if it were something dark and mysterious; as if to follow it, we must quench the light of our own minds. Now, the truth is, that the divine will is in harmony with our nature. It is God's approbation and injunction of that moral rectitude, of which the great lines are written on the human soul, and to which reason and conscience, even when they fail to secure obedience, do yet secretly, and in no small degree respond. The human mind and the divine law are not distinct and disconnected things. If man were not a law to himself, he could not receive the revelation of a law from Heaven. Were not the principle of duty an essential part of his mind, he could be bound to no obedience. Religion has its foundation in our moral nature, and is indeed its most enlarged and glorious form, and we lament that this great truth does not shine more brightly in the pages of Fenelon. We intended to give to it a particular discussion; but as we cannot do it justice in the present article, we prefer to dismiss it, and to offer a few miscellaneous remarks on that sentiment of love towards God, on which our author so perpetually insists.

We are aware, that to some men Fenelon may seem an enthusiast. Some may doubt or deny the possibility of that strong, deep, supreme affection towards the Supreme Being, with which Fenelon's book overflows. We wonder at this scepticism. We know no property of human nature more undoubted than its capacity and fulness of affection. We see its love overflowing in its domestic connexions, in friendships, and especially in its interest in being separated by oceans and the lapse of ages. Let it not be said, that the affections to which we here refer, have fellow beings for their objects, and do not therefore prove our capacity of religious attachment. The truth is, that one spirit runs through all our affections, as far as they are pure; and love to mankind directed aright, is the germ and element of love to the Divinity. Whatever is excellent and venerable in human beings, is of God, and in attaching ourselves to it we are preparing our hearts for its author. Whoever sees and recognises the moral dignity of impartial justice and disinterested goodness in his fellow creatures, has begun to pay homage to the attributes of God. The first emotion awakened in the soul, we mean filial attachment, is the dawning of love to our Father in Heaven. Our deep interest in the history of good and great men, our veneration towards enlightened legislators, our sympathy with philanthropists, our delight in mighty efforts of intellect consecrated to a good cause, all these sentiments prove our capacity of an affectionate reverence to God; for he is at once the inspirer and the model of this intellectual and moral grandeur in his creatures. We even think, that our love of nature has an affinity with the love of God, and was meant as a preparation for it; for the harmonies of nature are only his wisdom made visible; the heavens, so sublime, are a revelation of his immensity; and the beauty of creation images to us his overflowing

love and blessedness. To us, hardly any thing seems plainer, than that the soul was made for God. Not only its human affections guide it to him; not only its deep wants, its dangers, and helplessness, guide it to him; there are still higher indications of the end for which it was made. It has a capacity of more than human love, a principle or power of adoration, which cannot bound itself to finite natures, which carries up the thoughts above the visible universe, and which, in approaching God, rises into a solemn transport, a mingled awe and joy, prophetic of a higher life: and a brighter signature of our end and happiness cannot be conceived.

We are aware, that it may be objected, that many and great obstructions to a supreme love of God, belong to our very constitution and condition, and that these go far to disprove the doctrine of our being framed for religion as our chief good. But this argument does not move us. We learn from every survey of man's nature and history, that he is ordained to approach the end of his creation through many and great obstructions; that effort is the immutable law of his being; that a good, in proportion to its grandeur, is encompassed with hardship. The obstructions to religion are not greater than those to knowledge; and, accordingly, history gives as dark views of human ignorance as of human guilt. Yet who, on this ground, denies that man was formed for knowledge, that progress in truth is the path of nature, and that he has impulses which are to carry forward his intellectual powers without end? It is God's pleasure, in his provisions for the mind, as well as for the body, to give us in a rude state the materials of good, and to leave us to frame from them, amidst such conflict, a character of moral and religious excellence; and in this ordination we see his wise benevolence; for by this we may rise to the unutterable happiness of a free and moral union with our Creator. We ought to add, that the obstructions to the love of God, do not lie wholly in ourselves. Perhaps the greatest is a *false* theology. This interposes thick clouds between the soul and its Maker. It darkens and dishonours God and his works, and leaves nothing to sustain our trust and love.

The motives which are most commonly urged for cherishing supreme affection towards God, are drawn from our frailty and weakness, and from our need of more than human succour in the trials of life and in the pains of death. But religion has a still higher claim. It answers to the deepest want of human nature. We refer to the want of some being or beings, to whom we may give our hearts, whom we may love more than ourselves, for whom we may live and be ready to die, and whose character responds to that idea of perfection, which, however dim and undefined, is an essential element of every human soul. We cannot be happy beyond our love. At the same time, love may prove our chief woe, if bestowed unwisely, disproportionately, and on unworthy objects; if confined to beings of imperfect virtue, with whose feelings we cannot always innocently sympathize, whose interests we cannot always righteously promote, who narrow us to themselves instead of breathing universal charity, who are frail,

mutable, exposed to suffering, pain, and death. To secure a growing happiness and a spotless virtue, we need for the heart a being worthy of its whole treasure of love, to whom we may consecrate our whole being, in approaching whom we enter an atmosphere of purity and brightness, in sympathizing with whom we cherish only noble sentiments, in devoting ourselves to whom we espouse great and enduring interests, in whose character we find the spring of an ever-enlarging philanthropy, and by attachment to whom, all our other attachments are hallowed, protected, and supplied with tender and sublime consolations under bereavement and blighted hope. Such a being is God.

The word which Fenelon has most frequently used to express the happiness to which the mind ascends by a supreme love of God, is "peace," perhaps the most expressive which language affords. We fear, however, that its full import is not always received. There is a two-fold peace. The first is negative. It is relief from disquiet and corroding care. It is repose after conflict and storms. But there is another and a higher peace, to which this is but the prelude, "a peace of God which passeth all understanding," and properly called "the kingdom of heaven within us." This state is any thing but negative. It is the highest and most strenuous action of the soul, but an entirely harmonious action, in which all our powers and affections are blended in a beautiful proportion, and sustain and perfect one another. It is more than silence after storms. It is as the concord of all melodious sounds. Has the reader never known a season, when, in the fullest flow of thought and feeling, in the universal action of the soul, an inward calm, profound as midnight silence, yet bright as the still summer noon, full of joy, but unbroken by one throb of tumultuous passion, has been breathed through his spirit, and given him a glimpse and presage of the serenity of a happier world? Of this character, is the peace of religion. It is a conscious harmony with God and the creation, an alliance of love with all beings, a sympathy with all that is pure and happy, a surrender of every separate will and interest, a participation of the spirit and life of the universe, an entire concord of purpose with its Infinite Original. This is peace, and the true happiness of man; and we think that human nature has never entirely lost sight of this its great end. It has always sighed for a repose, in which energy of thought and will might be tempered with an all-pervading tranquillity. We seem to discover aspirations after this good, a dim consciousness of it, in all ages of the world. We think we see it in those systems of Oriental and Grecian philosophy, which proposed, as the consummation of present virtue, a release from all disquiet, and an intimate union and harmony with the Divine Mind. We even think, that we trace this consciousness, this aspiration, in the works of ancient art which time has spared to us, in which the sculptor, aiming to embody his deepest thoughts of human perfection, has joined with the fulness of life and strength, a repose which breathes into the spectator, an admiration as calm as it is exalted. Man, we believe, never wholly loses the sentiment of his true good. There are yearnings,

sighings, which he does not himself comprehend—which break forth alike in his prosperous and adverse seasons—which betray a deep indestructible faith in a good that he has not found—and which, in proportion as they grow distinct, rise to God, and concentrate the soul in him, as at once its life and rest, the fountain at once of energy and of peace.

In the remarks, which have now been suggested by the writings of Fenelon, we have aimed to free religion from exaggerations, which, we fear, weaken its influence over reasonable men, and at the same time to illustrate its dignity and happiness. We want time, or we should enlarge on the importance of this great subject to every human being. We cannot however leave it, without earnestly recommending it to the attention of men of superior minds. The neglect which it generally receives from these, is one of the most discouraging signs of our times. The claims of religion on intelligent men, are not yet understood; and the low place which it holds among the objects of liberal inquiry, will one day be recollected as the shame of our age. Some remarks on this topic may form a not unsuitable conclusion to the present article.

It is, we fear, an unquestionable fact, that religion, considered as an intellectual subject, is, in a great measure, left to a particular body of men, as a professional concern; and the fact is as much to be wondered at as deplored. It is wonderful that any mind, and especially a superior one, should not see in religion the highest object of thought. It is wonderful that the infinite God, the noblest theme of the universe, should be considered as a monopoly of professed theologians; that a subject so vast, awful, and exalting, as our relation to the Divinity, should be left to technical men, to be handled so much for sectarian purposes. Religion is the property and dearest interest of the human race. Every man has an equal concern in it. It should be approached with an independence on human authority. It should be rescued from all the factions, which have seized upon it as their particular possession. Men of the highest intellect should feel, that if there be a God, then his character and our relation to him throw all other subjects into obscurity, and that the intellect, if not consecrated to him, can never attain its true use, its full dimensions, and its proper happiness. Religion, if it be true, is central truth, and all knowledge, which is not gathered round it, and quickened and illuminated by it, is hardly worthy the name. To this great theme, we would summon all orders of mind, the scholar, the statesman, the student of nature, and the observer of life. It is a subject to which every faculty and every acquisition may pay tribute, which may receive aids and lights from the accuracy of the logician, from the penetrating spirit of philosophy, from the intuitions of genius, from the researches of history, from the science of the mind, from physical science, from every branch of criticism, and, though last not least, from the spontaneous suggestions and the moral aspirations of pure but unlettered men.

It is a fact which shocks us, and which shows the degraded state of religion, that not a few superior minds look down upon it as a subject beneath their investigation. Though allied with all knowledge, and especially with that of human nature and human duty, it is regarded as a separate and inferior study, particularly fitted to the gloom of a convent, and the seclusion of a minister. Religion is still confounded, in many and in gifted minds, with the jargon of monks, and the subtleties and strifes of theologians. It is thought a mystery, which, far from coalescing, wars with our other knowledge. It is never ranked with the sciences which expand and adorn the mind. It is regarded as a method of escaping future ruin, not as a vivifying truth through which the intellect and heart are alike to be invigorated and enlarged. Its bearing on the great objects of thought and the great interests of life is hardly suspected. This degradation of religion into a technical study, this disjunction of it from morals, from philosophy, from the various objects of liberal research, has done it infinite injury, has checked its progress, has perpetuated errors which gathered round it in times of barbarism and ignorance, has made it a mark for the sophistry and ridicule of the licentious, and has infused a lurking scepticism into many powerful understandings. Nor has religion suffered alone. The whole mind is darkened by the obscuration of this its central light. Its reasonings and judgments become unstable through want of this foundation to rest upon. Religion is to the whole sphere of truth, what God is to the universe, and in dethroning it, or confining it to a narrow range, we commit very much such an injury on the soul, as the universe would suffer, were the Infinite Being to abandon it, or to contract his energy to a small province of his creation.

The injury done to literature, by divorcing it from religion, is a topic worthy of separate discussion. Literature has thus lost power and permanent interest. It has become, in a great measure, superficial, an image of transient modes of thought, and of arbitrary forms of life, not the organ and expression of immutable truth, and of deep workings of the soul. We beg not to be misunderstood. We have no desire that literature should confine itself wholly or chiefly to religious topics, and we hardly know a greater calamity which it could incur, than by degenerating into religious cant. Next to profaneness, we dread the affectation of piety and the mechanical repetition of sacred phraseology. We only lament, that literature has so generally been the product and utterance of minds, which have not lived, thought, and written, under the light of a rational and sublime faith. Severed from this, it wants the principle of immortality. We do not speak lightly when we say, that all works of the intellect, which have not in some measure been quickened by the spirit of religion, are doomed to perish or to lose their power; and that genius is preparing for itself a sepulchre, when it disjoins itself from the Universal Mind. Religion is not always to remain in its present dark, depressed condition. Already there are signs of a brighter day. It begins to be viewed more generously. It is gradually attracting to itself superior understandings. It is rising from

the low rank of a professional, technical study, and asserting its supremacy among the objects of the mind. A new era, we trust, is opening upon the world, and all literature will feel its power. In proportion as the true and sublime conception of God shall unfold itself in the soul, and shall become there a central sun, shedding its beams on all objects of thought, there will be a want of sympathy with all works which have not been quickened by this heavenly influence. It will be felt that the poet has known little of nature, that he has seen it only under clouds, if he have not seen it under this celestial light. It will be felt, that man, the great subject of literature, when viewed in separation from his Maker and his end, can be as little understood and pourtrayed, as a plant torn from the soil in which it grew, and cut off from communication with the clouds and sun.

We are aware that objections will spring up to the doctrine, that all literature should be produced under the influence of religion. We shall be told, that in this way literature will lose all variety and spirit, that a monotonous and solemn hue will spread itself over writing, and that a library will have the air of a tomb. We do not wonder at this fear. Religion has certainly been accustomed to speak in sepulchral tones, and to wear any aspect but a bright and glowing one. It has lost its free and various movement. But let us not ascribe to its nature, what has befallen it from adverse circumstances. The truth is, that religion justly viewed, surpasses all other principles, in giving a free and manifold action to the mind. It recognises in every faculty and sentiment the workmanship of God, and assigns a sphere of agency to each. It takes our whole nature under its guardianship, and with a parental love ministers to its inferior as well as higher gratifications. False religion mutilates the soul, sees evil in our innocent sensibilities, and rules with a tyrant's frown and rod. True religion is a mild and lawful sovereign, governing to protect, to give strength, to unfold all our inward resources. We believe, that, under its influence, literature is to pass its present limits, and to put itself forth in original forms of composition. Religion is of all principles most fruitful, multiform, and unconfined. It is sympathy with that Being, who seems to delight in diversifying the modes of his agency, and the products of his wisdom and power. It does not chain us to a few essential duties, or express itself in a few unchanging modes of writing. It has the liberality and munificence of nature, which not only produces the necessary root and grain, but pours forth fruits and flowers. It has the variety and bold contrast of nature, which at the foot of the awful mountain, scoops out the freshest, sweetest valleys, and embosoms in the wild, troubled ocean, islands, whose vernal airs, and loveliness, and teeming fruitfulness, almost breathe the joys of Paradise. Religion will accomplish for literature what it most needs; that is, will give it depth, at the same time that it heightens its grace and beauty. The union of these attributes is most to be desired. Our literature is lamentably superficial, and to some, the beautiful and the superficial even seem to be naturally conjoined. Let not beauty be so wronged. It resides chiefly in

profound thoughts and feelings. It overflows chiefly in the writings of poets, gifted with a sublime and piercing vision. A beautiful literature springs from the depth and fulness of intellectual and moral life, from an energy of thought and feeling, to which nothing, as we believe, ministers so largely as enlightened religion.

So far from a monotonous solemnity overspreading literature, in consequence of the all-pervading influence of religion, we believe, that the sportive and comic forms of composition, instead of being abandoned, will only be refined and improved. We know that these are supposed to be frowned upon by piety; but they have their root in the constitution which God has given us, and ought not, therefore, to be indiscriminately condemned. The propensity to wit and laughter, does indeed, through excessive indulgence, often issue in a character of heartless levity, low mimickry, or unfeeling ridicule. It often seeks gratification in regions of impurity, throws a gaiety round vice, and sometimes even pours contempt on virtue. But, though often and mournfully perverted, it is still a gift of God, and may and ought to minister, not only to innocent pleasure, but to the intellect and the heart. Man was made for relaxation as truly as for labour; and by a law of his nature, which has not received the attention it deserves, he finds, perhaps, no relaxation so restorative, as that in which he reverts to his childhood, seems to forget his wisdom, leaves the imagination to exhilarate itself by sportive inventions, talks of amusing incongruities in conduct and events, smiles at the innocent eccentricities and odd mistakes of those whom he most esteems, allows himself in arch allusions or kind-hearted satire, and transports himself into a world of ludicrous combinations. We have said, that on these occasions, the mind seems to put off its wisdom; but the truth is, that in a pure mind, wisdom retreats, if we may so say, to its centre, and there unseen, keeps guard over this transient folly, draws delicate lines which are never to be passed in the freest moments, and, like a judicious parent watching the sports of childhood, preserves a stainless innocence of soul in the very exuberance of gaiety. This combination of moral power with wit and humour, with comic conceptions and irrepressible laughter, this union of mirth and virtue, belongs to an advanced stage of the character; and we believe, that in proportion to the diffusion of an enlightened religion, this action of the mind will increase, and will overflow in compositions, which, joining innocence to sportiveness, will communicate unmixed delight. Religion is not at variance with occasional mirth. In the same character, the solemn thought and the sublime emotions of the improved Christian, may be joined with the unanxious freedom, buoyancy, and gaiety of early years.

We will add but one more illustration of our views. We believe that the union of religion with genius, will favour that species of composition to which it may seem at first to be least propitious. We refer to that department of literature, which has for its object the delineation of the stronger and more terrible and guilty passions. Strange as it may appear, these gloomy and

appalling features of our nature may be best comprehended and pourtrayed by the purest and noblest minds. The common idea is, that overwhelming emotions, the more they are experienced, can the more effectually be described. We have one strong presumption against this doctrine. Tradition leads us to believe, that Shakspeare, though he painted so faithfully and fearfully the storms of passion, was a calm and cheerful man. The passions are too engrossed by their objects to meditate on themselves; and none are more ignorant of their growth and subtle workings than their own victims. Nothing reveals to us the secrets of our own souls like religion; and in disclosing to us, in ourselves, the tendency of passion to absorb every energy, and to spread its hues over every thought, it gives us a key to all souls; for in all, human nature is essentially one, having the same spiritual elements, and the same grand features. No man, it is believed, understands the wild and irregular motions of the mind, like him in whom a principle of divine order has begun to establish peace. No man knows the horror of thick darkness which gathers over the slaves of vehement passion, like him who is rising into the light and liberty of virtue. There is indeed a selfish shrewdness, which is thought to give a peculiar and deep insight into human nature. But the knowledge of which it boasts, is partial, distorted, and vulgar, and wholly unfit for the purposes of literature. We value it little. We believe, that no qualification avails so much to a knowledge of human nature in all its forms, in its good and evil manifestations, as that enlightened, celestial charity, which religion alone inspires; for this establishes sympathies between us and all men, and thus makes them intelligible to us. A man imbued with this spirit, alone contemplates vice, as it really exists, and as it ought always to be described. In the most depraved fellow-beings, he sees partakers of his own nature. Amidst the terrible ravages of the passions, he sees conscience, though prostrate, not destroyed, nor wholly powerless. He sees the proofs of an unextinguished moral life, in inward struggles, in occasional relentings, in sighings for lost innocence, in reviving throbs of early affections, in the sophistry by which the guilty mind would become reconciled to itself, in remorse, in anxious forebodings, in despair, perhaps in studied recklessness and cherished self-forgetfulness. These conflicts between the passions and the moral nature, are the most interesting subjects in the branch of literature to which we refer, and we believe, that to pourtray them with truth and power, the man of genius can find in nothing such effectual aid, as in the developement of the moral and religious principles in his own breast.

We have given but a superficial view of a great subject. The connexion of religion with intellect and literature is yet to be pointed out. We conclude with expressing our strong conviction that the human mind will become more various, piercing, and all-comprehending, more capable of understanding and expressing the solemn and the sportive, the terrible and the beautiful, the profound and the tender, in proportion as it shall be illumined and penetrated by the true knowledge of God. Genius, intellect,

imagination, taste, and sensibility, must all be baptized into religion, or they will never know, and never make known, their real glory and immortal power.

THE CHRISTIAN PIONEER.

GLASGOW, *August* 1, 1829.

THE Synod of Ulster assembled at Lurgan, on the 30th of June, and continued its meetings till the 8th of July. The Rev. P. White, the late Moderator, delivered the sermon, from the Epistle to Titus ii. 15, on the importance of the Christian ministry, and the difficulties attending the proper discharge of its duties.

This Assembly has more and more confirmed our impression, as to the pernicious tendency—the antichristianity of ecclesiastical courts. We are persuaded that no man can thoroughly stand fast in that liberty wherewith Christ has made his disciples free, whilst he continues a member of such a tribunal. Despotism, of the most odious and disgusting character, there rears its unblushing front—calumny and vituperation abound, and every evil passion is engendered and nourished in rankest luxuriance. We wish the Church of Christ well rid of such meetings; they never yet did good, we believe, and we think they never will. Their prototype is the iron bed of Procrustes, and he only who is content to have his faith stretched or contracted, his intellect dwarfed, and his bosom narrowed, at the mandate of would-be inquisitors, is a fitting associate of such establishments.

We pass over the ineffectual attempts of Mr. Magill of Antrim, as to Mr. Porter and the clerkship of the Synod, only recording one burst of his splendid oratory in reply to the Moderator, who had decided that he was in order. "Yes, Sir, if *I* am not in order, there is no order in the Universe!" We must, however, express our regret, that Mr. Carlile of Dublin, from whom better things might reasonably have been expected, should have involved the Synod in a discussion regarding some of the ministers having travelled on the Sabbath. "The Northern Whig" newspaper would not report the debate, because it was its opinion, that "the cause of pure and undefiled religion, the cause of Presbyterianism, and the character of the Synod of Ulster, would all suffer in the detail."—"The debate was introduced in bad taste, it was conducted with a bad spirit, and it ended in engendering the worst feelings of the human heart."

The major portion of the proceedings of the assembly, relate to the appointment of the Rev. John Ferrie of Glasgow, to the chair of Moral Philosophy in the Belfast Institution, vacant by the lamented decease of its talented possessor, Dr. Young. The Synod had appointed a Committee to examine the testimonials of candidates for the office, and had instructed the Moderator of the Synod

to vote for the Rev. ——— Carlile, but had also pronounced Mr. Ferrie to be "eligible." This word excited the indignation of many of the members of the Synod; they contended, that it ought not to have been employed, unless the Committee had been confident as to the "orthodoxy" of Mr. Ferrie. Especially did it rouse the ire of Mr. Cooke, who, on Dr. Wright proposing that the conduct of the Committee be approved, spoke as follows:—

If I thought it necessary, said Mr Cooke, I might assail the existence of the Committee on the grounds of want of regularity in its constitution; but I prefer letting this irregularity pass, as I do not wish unnecessarily to occupy the time of the house. I could have wished that Dr. Wright, or any one who intended to support the original motion, would have given his arguments upon the subject. It is not very possible that any thing which Dr. Wright could say, would make any alteration in my sentiments; but still he might advance something which would show me a sufficient reason for not pressing my amendment. I enter upon this discussion, if not with reluctance, at least with pain. It must be grating to the feelings of every member of this house, to come into annual collision with a large portion of the property of the Metropolis of the North, united with its literary and commercial interests. I am aware that our peculiar opinions and religious sentiments must necessarily be disagreeable to the majority of these respectable individuals. I enter upon this discussion—not because I love it,—but because it has been forced upon us. There is another reason why this collision must be peculiarly grating to myself. I am obliged to be personal with regard to myself, and perhaps with regard to others. A gentleman, high in estimation for professional eminence and literary attainments, has been pleased to say that the argument which I used is a quibble, the absurdity of which, any man with a plain understanding may perceive. I do think it is hard that I should be accused by this gentleman of quibbling, because I could not see the case precisely in the same point of view that his high and exalted genius can observe it. It is also painful to me, that I am obliged to reflect upon the conduct of one acting under the sanction of this house—that I am obliged to have reference to the religious opinions of the individual most interested in this discussion, and to the religious opinions of those who are chiefly connected with it. Were any one to say, that virtually the great majority of those who elected Mr. Ferrie, would elect an Arian merely because he was an Arian, he would be denounced as ignorant or something worse, and met with the cry of *Credat Judæus Apella*. I am ignorant enough to think so, and I say *Credo*. When an individual of high literary character, of eminent talents, and distinguished moral worth—when Reuben John Bryce was a candidate for a Professor's chair, whom did the Board of Managers and Visitors elect? They elected an individual, respectable, indeed, in his personal and literary character; but the world knows, that, as a scholar, he was not to be compared with him. In spite of literary eminence, and by this, *ceteris paribus*, the Board of Managers and Visitors have pledged themselves to vote—in spite of literary eminence, they elected the inferior candidate in opposition to the superior claims of another, whose only crime was his orthodoxy. There was another reason, it is true, there was

——————— Some fifteen hundred pounds a-year,
Which make all things both straight and clear!

But the successful candidate was an Arian, and this was his chief recommendation. I do not mean to throw any aspersions upon the electors. They are all "good men and true." They have pledged themselves to vote upon the principle of literary supremacy. But the fact is—and "facts are stubborn chiels that dinna ding"—the fact is, they voted

against the orthodox candidate, when in literary attainments he was superior, and in moral worth and in every other respect he was equal. Here is a fact which I produce against the gentleman's assertion; and now of the assertion I will only say, *valeat quantum valere potest*. There is another fact which comes more immediately before us. The world —I do not mean the great world, but the little Presbyterian world around us—will tell you—ninety-nine out of a hundred of them—will tell you, that Mr. Carlile, though in point of literary character he was pre-eminently superior, was rejected, and that Arianism again carried the day. Yes, there were those in the Board of Managers and Visitors, who rejoiced at the opportunity of giving it in the teeth to the Synod; and they elected a man, whose literary character is no more to be compared with the character of Mr. Carlile, than mine is to be compared with that of either one or other. Dr. Drummond said, that in the former case Mr. Bryce was the superior candidate; and I would poll the Presbyterian world, and I would prove that Mr. Carlile stands pre-eminently higher in their estimation as a man of literary attainments. I would appeal to every rank—to our farmers, our merchants, and to those who represent the intellectual interests, our physicians and our ministers. I would ask, what has Mr. Ferrie written to compare with the works which Mr. Carlile has given to the world? What books has this gentleman sent forth, and what are his pretensions? Some Professors in the University of Glasgow have put forth a sort of round-robin respecting him. In this testimonial, I see the names of Professors of Astronomy and Lecturers on Midwifery; but I do not see the name of the Professor of Divinity. Dr. Macgill was applied to on the occasion; but the Doctor clapped his hands in his pocket, and said—"hem!" There was much meaning in that. The Doctor knew of a sermon which had been preached upon original sin, about which I'll tell you more just now; and he would not sign Mr. Ferrie's testimonials. But the original sin of the present matter is this:—certain gentlemen were fully determined to annihilate our ranks; they could not effect much by attacking us in front, and so they resolved to set up a little bye-battery, which would infilade our lines. I have given you two examples of the fire which they have kept up upon us. Where the moral character of the candidates were equal, and the literary qualifications of the orthodox man greatly superior, they rejected the orthodox, and chose the Arian. But, under this fearful battery, we have merely to place a few grains of gunpowder—clap the linstock to it, and it is gone! A gentleman, who is present, has told me a fact. I do not know whether he be an Elder or not; but I know he is a true blue, and he stated that he heard, with his two ears, one of the electors say, that they had elected Mr. Ferrie just to give a knock down to the Synod. Now this is all fair and civil. The electors are classical—they know the phrase, *Apollo vellet aurem;* and, improving upon the phrase, they give the Synod a knock on both sides of the head, by way of admonishing them. They cannot complain if the Synod should return the compliment, withdraw their pupils, and leave the Arian Professor of Moral Philosophy to enjoy learned ease, and just do nothing at all. There is another point to which I would direct the attention of the house. It is to the broad fact, that Mr. Ferrie's heterodoxy was fairly and roundly and repeatedly brought before the Committee. One gentleman said, that he believed Mr. Ferrie was orthodox, as he had subscribed the Westminster Confession of Faith. He added more; he said, if he had signed it without believing it, he would have thought him viler than Judas Iscariot. Notwithstanding all this, it appeared in that Committee, that members were not sure but he might be an Arminian. Now, if he were an Arminian, and if he signed that book, he was one of the vilest of the vile; he was one of the grossest hypocrites on earth. The Westminster Confession of Faith

was the most Calvinistic book upon earth, with the exception of the Bible!!! [This phrase excited considerable laughter among those who were most forward in expressing their approbation of Mr. Cooke's address. The Moderator interfered, and reproved so indecorous behaviour when the name of the Sacred Volume was alluded to.] Saying that he might be an Arminian, was no other than saying, that he might be a hypocrite, and that he signed a creed which he did not believe. Dr. Hanna expressed great doubtings and surmisings respecting Mr. Ferrie's orthodoxy. I have not heard whether the Committee called upon the Doctor to explain his surmisings, which, acquainted as he is with systems, he could so easily do. But in spite of all the Doctor's doubtful doubts, they put doubts to flight; and if the Doctor be now upon the stool of repentance, let him take what he gets, for he richly deserves it. Further, I will establish by two witnesses, that Mr. Montgomery said in the Committee, speaking of Mr. Ferrie—"He is not what *you* would call orthodox, nor what *I* would call orthodox." If this fact be established, I would ask Dr. Wright on what grounds he would justify the Committee? I have already established the fact by one witness, and I think I will establish it by another; and yet there was Dr. Hanna, and there was the ex-Moderator, and there was Mr. Paterson and the rest—all honourable, all orthodox men; and they pronounce Mr. Ferrie orthodox, and write upon his back "eligible," and send in to the Managers and Visitors a man of whom they know nothing. The Board prefers him to Mr. Carlile, who has been an author almost every year since he became a member of the Synod—the Secretary to the Hibernian Bible Society—a man who came to the assistance of that glorious institution, when it was stranded on the quicksands, and had righted the goodly vessel, and sent her forward like a first-rate sail in her blessed and glorious course. Yet this is the man whom the electors rejected as possessing minor accomplishments, when put in competition with Mr. Ferrie. But there is, in the certificate which Mr. Ferrie procured from the Glasgow College, a deficiency that speaks volumes. There is a silence in it which speaks like a voice from the grave, and which should have been attended to. Where are the names of the men who should have spoken, and who would have spoken, if Mr. Ferrie were orthodox? Where are those names that constitute, as it were, the *avant couriers* of orthodoxy in Scotland?—where is the name of Chalmers—where is the name of Macgill—where is the name of Dewar—where is the name of Wardlaw—where is the name of a single Minister, who, like our friends around us, has borne the heat and labour of the day? Among all these eminent individuals, there is not one that testifies for Mr. Ferrie. That gentleman was not one of those roses who are born to blush unseen—he was not a student from the Highlands, wasting his sweetness on the heath and by the brook side; he was like a city set upon a hill, that cannot be hid. He had been placed for seven long years on the very tiptop of the steeple of the College of Glasgow, and yet in all the phalanx of orthodoxy, there is not one who certifies for him—not one of these eminent men has certified for his orthodoxy;—*there is not one orthodox man that testifies to Mr. Ferrie's orthodoxy!* Oh! there is in this silence a voice that speaks trumpet-tongued, and it is impossible to resist it. Among his other testimonials, Mr. Ferrie has that of a Mr. Taylor, who may be just as obscure as your humble servant. But, suppose he should turn out to be one of the brightest stars in the galaxy, what has he said about Mr. Ferrie? Why—that he is sound in the faith—sound in the faith! I have heard of sounding brass and tinkling cymbal. Sound in the faith! In the same acceptation of the phrase, Priestley and the great modern lights of Arianism, may be all called sound in the faith! These are like the sybiline words used by the oracle of Delphi. The woman who sat upon the threefooted stool, said to Pyrrhus, when he asked if he would

be successful in his expedition against the Romans, "*Aio te Eacidas Romanos vincere posse;*" and when Pyrrhus complained after he was beaten, he got for his answer, "You have no right to say you were deceived: you foolish man—you did not understand your Latin." I do not know who this Mr. Taylor is. It may turn out that he is orthodox even beyond orthodoxy itself.

Dr. Thomson here said, that Mr. Taylor was the Minister of St. Enoch's, in Glasgow.

Mr. Cooke—Oh, I know him; and many a time have I been sorely put to the test to keep myself from sleeping when I was listening to his preaching. The good Doctor is dead a year ago, and is himself sleeping with his fathers. I am astonished that Dr. Hanna did not know more about Mr. Ferrie. He had proof enough of his principles, so far as *fama clamosa* goes, and he is bound to defend the rising generation from such men. I myself heard from a merchant in Glasgow—a man of the highest respectability, that Mr. Ferrie was an Arian—to use his phrase—an absolute Arian, or something worse than all this—a downright liberal in religion—a Neologist! I am one of those who are backward in quoting authorities. I will prove that the public opinion in Scotland is, that Mr. Ferrie is an Arian—or rather that he is a New Light—that is, what is known on the Continent by the name Neologist—a nondescript sort of thing, which is neither Arian, Arminian, nor Socinian; but just that lovely production of modern times—a Liberal! If this individual be injured by report, he can set himself right with the public. Let him go to the Divinity Professor of Glasgow, and say, "Dr. Macgill, you are one of the first authorities in our church; give me your certificate that all those reports about me are unfounded, and that you believe that when I signed the Westminster Confession of Faith, I believed it!" Let him go to Dr. Dewar, and say, "I have been calumniated; certify for my principles." Let him go to Dr. Wardlaw, whose praise is in all the churches. Let him go to Dr. Chalmers, and make a similar request to him. Let him go to James Muir. Let him go to our reverend friends who are here,* and say, "Gentlemen, you know my character has been injured; and I call upon you to bear witness against the calumnies which have been circulated against me." I now come to the part of the question which more immediately concerns this body. I oppose not Mr. Ferrie's election—I have not the most distant idea of doing so. He may lecture as he pleases in the Belfast Institution, and I would be the last person to detract from the public reputation his lectures may possess. But I oppose him as a professor of Moral Philosophy to our students. I would say to my fathers and brethren, send not your sheep there for pasture—*anguis latet in herba.* The Managers and Visitors are liberal minded men—liberal in the best sense of the word. I would say to them, "Gentlemen, use your College as you please, and may it increase and prosper; but you have got one at present in it, and until he is removed, we will not send our students there; we will have another man and another place to educate them." I have stated the reasons of my extreme regret, that I have so frequently been compelled to appear as the accuser of the Belfast Institution. I regret that I am again compelled to take the same course; but I am compelled to do so. I do charge the Managers and Visitors with having acted ungratefully towards us. When the Government had put us like masters over them—when they gave us a control over five of their professorships—when they said to us, gentlemen, let your Moderator write but the word *veto*, and our grant is resumed,—we did not exercise our rights. We said to the electors—

* The Rev. Dr. Burns of Paisley, and the Rev. Mr. Heugh of Glasgow, of the Scottish Mission, who had been previously introduced to the Synod.

no; we do not want to be put over you; we wish to be on an equality. When the Government had given us a power, and when we had been solicited again and again to exercise it, we declined to do so. We said, that we just ought to have the same influence that the public should have over a stage coach, or any other travelling conveyance. The proprietors of the coach advertise their intention of running their coach to such and such a place, at such a price, and their intention of having a good and careful guard and coachman. We say to them, choose your our own guards and your own coachmen. We do not want to dictate to you in this respect; but we'll just give you a neighbourly advice. If you employ a driver who will upset the coach in a ditch, to the hazard of the lives of the passengers, we will have nothing to do with him or the stage he is driving. We will go with you all the way that suits our own safety and convenience; but we will not travel this particular stage until the careless driver is removed. I hoped this forbearance, on the part of the Synod, would have been appreciated as it ought. I feel particularly grieved that I was disappointed. I myself proposed the concession we have made, and I fear I have been duped by my wish for conciliation. I was the person who proposed to the Committee to surrender the power the Government had given us. When they said that they never thought I would consent to it, I said at once, I will consent to it. I do, therefore, doubly grieve that duty compels me to take the course I am about to adopt. I will detain the house no longer, but proceed to move, as an amendment, the following resolutions:—

Resolved—That the duty of the Synod's Committee was, according to the Overtures of the Synod in 1825, to examine the testimonials of candidates, and to give their opinion with equal reference to the literary eminence and religious orthodoxy of the candidates.

That, while we have not the most distant idea of exercising any undue influence in the election of Professors, we regret that the electors did not, in the late election, concur with the recommendation of the Moderator.

That, as the Moral Philosophy chair is one of the greatest importance to the religious education of our Students, we deem it expedient to appoint a Committee to ascertain the religious opinions of Mr. Ferrie, and to submit their Report to the Synod, to be convened for the purpose.

I think it right, before we come to issue with the Institution, to take time to make a little inquiry. It is for this reason that I wish to have a Committee appointed. I think it is an act of justice to our students and to Mr. Ferrie. I have no wish that it should be an orthodox Committee. Let there be in it some of those gentlemen who differ from us, that they may keep up their *espionage* upon us. But let us examine into the orthodoxy of Mr. Ferrie. If there were only the shadow of a doubt, it should be removed: for the shadow might afterwards prove to be an impenetrable cloud, which would hide from us the glorious sun of truth. Mr. Ferrie's heterodoxy is established in the minds of some of the most eminent men in the Church of Scotland. But were there only a suspicion of it, he is not fit to fill the Moral Philosophy chair. Your Professor should be like Cæsar's wife—above suspicion. Were he adverse to the faith, he has many means of spreading the religious virus—the moral miasma, without directly attempting to do so. It will not do, when the plague is raging, to send a Committee of some sort of physicians to fumigate the apartments, and to whitewash the walls. We must remove all for whom we are interested, from the deadly contagion. Neither will it do to send some good-natured people of our church to sign a declaration of a Professor's orthodoxy, of which they entertain some doubt, and then hang it about the necks of our Students, like what many of our friends in the country call a *gospel!* An Arian Professor will corrupt the fountain at its very source; the bitter waters will sap the foundations of our religion, and fill the soul with doubts and misgivings which would flow

on to all eternity! An Arian professor may do all this, without directly violating his compact. When such a man as Chalmers is spoken of, he may say—*poh*, he is a frothy writer. He may sneer at missionary labours and vital religion. If a man impugned the doctrine of original sin, he might be spoken of as a sound philosopher and rational Christian. The young men might be forced to give in an appeal, and the *Senatus* would overrule it. Thus the moral contagion would be going on, till, like the leprosy, it reached from the crown of the head to the sole of the foot. That Mr. Ferrie is a Socinian, I will produce proof. That a memorial was presented to the Senatus of Glasgow College, I will prove by *vivo voce* evidence, and that the majority of the students petitioned for his removal from the office of College Chaplain. I will produce one of the individuals who signed the paper, calling upon the Senatus to remove him. And now, Moderator, without knowing whether there be any man in this house who will second the resolutions, I move they be adopted.

Mr. Carlile.—As I have been brought forward in the business of to-day, I deem it expedient to address you in the early part of the debate, because though I have not wished to take any part in the business, yet there are certain facts which the Synod should be put in possession of. I did not intend to present myself as a candidate for the chair, until I was surprised by Mr. Horner's calling on me one morning, and stating that he had received a letter from Mr. Cooke about it, mentioning, that it would be pleasing to the Synod—that the Arians would have no objection to it—and that I should be a great benefit to the Institution. I was reluctant to proceed in the business, my thoughts at the time being occupied in a way that forbade me to care about the world, until I got a letter from Mr. Morgan, and another from Mr. Henry, urging me to it. I then suffered my name to go forward. It was intimated to me, that credentials would be required, which did not altogether please me; however, it was urged, that my refusing to obtain credentials might be construed into pride: I then wrote to Dr. Gregory and others, and my friends also have obtained such a body of credentials as have quite astonished me.—Mr. Carlile then mentioned his coming to Belfast, and his astonishment at being advised not to collect any testimonials from the Synod of Ulster, as the more he had from members of that body, the more it would thwart his election. He knew that a regular canvass had been carried on—letters had been addressed by the friends of Mr. Ferrie on the other side of the water to their friends in Dublin, requesting them to write to those persons who might be instrumental, in Belfast, in electing Mr. Ferrie. I might have succeeded in the election, had I chosen to descend to such means; but I could never have lifted up my head after it. I went as far as I thought I could do consistently: I provided testimonials of my competency for the situation, and there I stopped. I confess I should have been glad of the professorship of Moral Philosophy, because my habits and thoughts were turned that way; but when I saw what charges might have been brought against me, I was glad to have escaped. It appears to me extraordinary, that whilst the electors were so reluctant to receive testimonials from the Synod, they put so much faith in the College of Glasgow. Do they not know, that the Glasgow College have a deep interest in the Belfast Institution's being put down? Do they not know, that it is depriving them of a large sum of money per annum, by its educating those students who formerly went there? And do they not know how jealous they were of the Institution at first? As for myself, I never cared for the professorship—it would not have put one farthing in my pocket. I know there will be a great many prejudices against me, and it will be said that I am speaking now as if in anger at my overthrow, but I care not. There are two points which require the consideration of the Synod. 1st, Whether we can go on with the Institution or not? Is the Synod to be told, that a testimonial of theirs, in-

stead of assisting a candidate, will throw him out? Mr. Cooke took alarm at the election of Mr. Bruce; and when numbers attempted to put him down, I was the only person who stood up in his defence. At that time, a deputation from the Institution assured us that there would be nothing of a similar character in future, and I was satisfied: a similar thing has occurred again; and I now conceive, that unless there be some radical change in the Belfast Institution, we must give up all connection with that establishment. The second question is—Shall we send our students to Mr. Ferrie? I ask, will our students be safe with Mr. Ferrie? I say no. It is too serious to send our students to a man who is reasonably suspected. The moment any arrangement is made which renders it dangerous for our students to attend the Institution, we should drop our connection with it. I say, Mr. Ferrie is a New-Light preacher—he is called, in his testimonials, a *rational* Christian preacher, which is a kind of masonic word by which Unitarians are known in Britain. I have listened to the sermons of the *rational* preachers in Scotland, and I never heard in them one word about eternity, about the soul of man, or about heaven, or about hell! They were exactly such as I have been accustomed to hear from the pulpits of the New-Light ministers of this country. I know my motives may be impugned, but I care not; and I sit down with the conviction, that the Synod will think I have been actuated by pure motives. I had a duty to discharge, and I look not to the imputations that may be thrown upon me.

Dr. Thomson—one of the deputation from the Belfast Institution, having obtained permission to speak—commenced by returning thanks to the Moderator and the Rev. Synod, for the courtesy and kindness which had been extended to him, in allowing him to occupy their time at that late hour, and particularly for the marked compliment conferred, in putting off the missionary sermon which was intended to be delivered that evening, in order to permit his availing himself of the only opportunity he could have to address the Synod. Were he to consider his own feelings, and, probably, his reputation, he would decline again occupying their attention, after having had such frequent calls to do so, by the questions put to him in the preceding part of the day; but he stood there as a deputy from the Board of Managers and Visitors of the Academical Institution; and he felt it his duty to waive all such personal considerations, and to endeavour, as he best could, to defend that Institution against the attacks made upon it in the speeches of the two reverend gentlemen [Messrs. Cooke and Carlile]. It had been truly said by the reverend gentleman who had obtained for him a hearing, that the Managers of the Institution had been assailed, their conduct and their motives traduced and vilified in a manner hitherto unexampled in the annals of that body. He would not attempt to make a regular reply to the two speeches—to that he felt altogether unequal; but he must make a few observations upon the charges brought forward by the reverend speakers, of impure and unworthy motives which had operated in determining the election of Mr. Ferrie. They had charged Mr. Ferrie with being an Arian, or, at least, unsound in his religious faith; and that for this reason, as well as by way of opposition to the Synod of Ulster, he had been elected the Professor of Moral Philosophy, by a majority of the Boards. Now, never was there a charge more unwarranted or unfounded.

The Boards were men—they were, therefore, fallible; and may have been in error in their choice, though he thought himself prepared and enabled to show that they were not. Their choice was honest and conscientious, and so were their motives. The Boards, pursuant to the fundamental principles of the Institution, took into their consideration the moral and literary qualifications only of the candidates; but if they had done otherwise, could they have doubted the orthodoxy of a man who is a licentiate of the Established Church of Scotland, and the Chap-

lain to the University of Glasgow? Much had been said of a *fama clamosa*, with respect to Mr. Ferrie's religious principles. Such *fama clamosa* had never reached the electors; and were he (Dr. T.) to insert in his dictionary the meaning of these words as employed on this occasion, he would translate them by the terms "calumny and slander." For his own part, he disavowed, in the most positive manner, that he was influenced by any such views as to Mr. Ferrie's religious opinions, and he was firmly persuaded of the same with respect to the other electors. If, however, they had been misled in their choice, by whom were they so misled?—by the Principal and eleven Professors of the University of Glasgow; by at least a dozen ministers of the Established Church of Scotland, that Church which had been so lately announced by a reverend gentleman from Scotland (the Rev. Dr. Burns, a missionary minister), as the mother of Presbyterianism in Ireland; and last, but not least, they had been ensnared and betrayed by the respectable Committee of the Synod, in their report of the eligibility of Mr. Ferrie. Was it possible, was it conceivable, that after an election so made, the Synod was to turn upon the electors, and to strangle them in the very trap thus laid, unless they consented to surrender their independence, and to deliver themselves, bound hand and foot, to the disposal of the Synod? But he did not charge the respectable Committee of the Synod with any such treachery. They had conscientiously, he believed, returned Mr. Ferrie as eligible, and he could never believe that the Synod would really attempt to visit the Institution with the consequences threatened.

A reverend speaker [Mr. Carlile] has employed various arguments and inferences to show that the Boards were actuated, in their preference of Mr. Ferrie, by a spirit of opposition to the Synod of Ulster. I unequivocally deny the assertion. He has alleged, in proof, that a document in his favour, signed by several ministers of the Synod, which came too late to be transmitted with his other testimonials, was suppressed by that friend to whom it was entrusted, on the plea that it would have prejudiced his cause; for that the electors were determined to oppose the view of the Synod.

Now, Sir, what will this body think, when I tell them, that *I*—an elector, who, you may by this time have seen, am not likely to take a lukewarm part in our transactions—*I never heard, never knew*, that such a document was in existence until we entered the Board-room to make our election. *I never saw it, nor knew its contents*, till I read it this day, annexed to the printed copy of Mr. Carlile's testimonials. Sir, if this document had been fairly exhibited to the electors, I hesitate not to assert, that it would have been received and considered with that attention and respect to which it was so justly entitled. Still, Sir, we should have reserved to ourselves the right of judging. But, Sir, is the mismanagement of Mr. Carlile's friends to be imputed to us as a crime?

Mr. Carlile has been told, that he lost his election by the remissness of his friends in not pushing his interests. He has heard that an active canvass was carried on for Mr. Ferrie—that Glasgow was "ransacked" for letters from the mercantile body there to the mercantile body here, soliciting them to forward his interests; and he has inferred that they were thereby promoted. Sir, I disclaim the operation of such interference; for myself, I disdain the imputation. I believe firmly that no such considerations mingled in the election—no ideas of advantage in the sale or purchase of barilla, of rum, or of cotton, ever entered the heads of any of the electors. Mr. Carlile has claimed an acquittal from all unworthy motives attaching to himself in this business. He has said, he would disdain such a charge. Of such a charge I fully and honourably acquit him; I believe him far above it. I ask, then, no more than such an acquittal for myself and for the majority who elected Mr. Ferrie; I know we are entitled to it. Mr. Carlile has told us, that he never dreamed of

proposing himself as a candidate for the vacant chair, till he was invited to do so by a reverend minister of this Synod; and that this invitation was afterwards backed by some, or one of the electors, I forget which. I believe it; I have heard it all before. Now, Sir, what does this amount to? Is it not *management, interference, intrigue?* The Synod of Ulster, or some of its members, not content to assist our judgment in the choice of candidates *who might propose themselves, kindly go in search of one for us!* With respect to the conduct of any elector in so inviting a candidate, I must disapprove of it. He is thereby bound to vote for that candidate, let who will propose himself afterwards; and if Malebranche or Locke, if Professor Reid or Dugald Stewart could arise from the dead to offer themselves for the vacant chair, *still he must vote for the candidate he had invited.*

Having now shown, as he hoped, satisfactorily, that the alleged motives did not operate in the election of Mr. Ferrie, Dr. T. said, he would endeavour to place before the Synod, the grounds upon which the preference of the electors actually rested. These grounds were contained in the small pamphlet which he held in his hand—a printed copy of the testimonials of Mr. Ferrie. These testimonials were given by the Principal, and a number of the Professors of the University of Glasgow, by a number of Ministers of the Church of Scotland, and by several medical and other literary gentlemen, all of whom professed to have known Mr. Ferrie for many years. Now, Sir, what is the bearing, what is the gist of these documents? Every one of them contains direct and positive testimony not only to the general and great abilities of Mr. Ferrie, but particularly to the devotedness with which he had applied himself to the study of Moral Philosophy and Metaphysics, and of the success of his investigations in this very branch of science—the branch of which we were about to appoint a teacher.

Besides these printed testimonials, the electors have had in their possession private letters from various eminent individuals, to the same effect. Two of these only, he would advert to: one was from Dr. Meikleham, of whom he (Dr. T.) knew nothing, but that he was Professor of Natural Philosophy in the University of Glasgow, and he thus wrote of Mr. Ferrie: "He is a man of a very sound understanding, clear views, and a profound reasoner. His peculiar walk is the philosophy of mind, and moral and metaphysical science; and the just and sound views he entertains, he expresses with uncommon distinctness, with much force, and so as to impress them in a convincing and satisfactory manner. You will be in great luck, indeed, if he shall be Dr. Young's successor." The other from the Rev. Dr. Couper, Professor of Astronomy, containing the following expressions: "It may be proper to inform you, that the highly favourable opinion I have formed of Mr. Ferrie, is founded chiefly upon the evidence he has given of talent in the discharge of his duty, as one of the College Chaplains for several sessions of College; in which situation I heard his discourses with the greatest pleasure, and often did I then think, that *in case of a vacancy in any of the Moral Philosophy Chairs in a Scottish University, he was the man of all that were known to me, most likely to discharge the duties of that situation with great ability.*" Again—"From the moment I heard of Dr. Young's death, Mr. Ferrie occurred to me, along with a number of others here, as the person *by far the most fit of any one we knew*, to discharge the important duties of that situation, with advantage to the Institution and honour to himself."

Now, what are the testimonials produced by Mr. Carlile? Here he (Dr. T.) rejoiced that he was not called on to disparage the merits and abilities of that gentleman. So far from it, he most cheerfully and cordially joined in every eulogium that had been passed upon him. However high the pedestal on which the reverend gentleman (Mr. Cooke) or the

reverend Synod which he was addressing, might desire to place Mr. Carlile, if the aid of his (Dr. T.'s) feeble arm were required for his elevation, it should be heartily given. That gentleman was well known as a distinguished divine and eminent theologian—the author of many able works, several of which he (Dr. T.) had read with pleasure and admiration. *But these works were all theological.* The reverend gentleman had, as a minister of the Gospel, with high and conscientious devotion, applied himself to the more immediate duties of his calling. It greatly became him so to do, and he (Dr. T.) highly honoured him for it. But was there, in all the testimonials which he had produced, any evidence of his peculiar application to Moral Philosophy or Metaphysics? He (Mr. T.) could find but one solitary and feeble testimony to this effect. He challenged, he defied the whole Synod, or any member of it, to show such evidence. Nay, Sir, in the very letter which the reverend gentleman addressed to the electors, proposing himself as a candidate, he spoke of the pleasure with which he should *resume* the studies of his earlier days. This letter he quoted from recollection only, and would bow to the correction of the gentleman himself; but he believed—he was sure, that he was substantially correct. [Here Mr. Carlile admitted the general correctness, but offered some explanation, which we could not distinctly hear, from the distance.] Mr. Carlile's testimonials abundantly prove, if such proof to us were necessary, his great talents, and the capability with which the powers of his mind *might* be applied to Moral Philosophy. But, Sir, we wanted a Professor *ready made*, and such we found in Mr. Ferrie. The force of testimony in his favour—the concentration of the rays into one focus, all bearing on the same point, was such as we could not resist—we surrendered ourselves to it, and he was elected. Dr. T. then adverted to the speech of Mr. Cooke, who introduced the resolutions. To that speech he (Dr. T.) had listened with delight at its ability, but not with conviction. It was a blaze of eloquence, in which the torch of truth was smothered and extinguished.

Mr. Cooke disclaimed all wish to obtain any undue influence over the Institution. He had declared, on a former occasion, that all he desired for the Synod was, to have the privilege of an *avisamentum* with respect to our proceedings. This word Dr. T. does not find in his dictionary. He presumed it was barbarous Latin, and conjectured its meaning was an *advice* or *opinion*. Oh! it was a soft, a honeyed word. But what did the proceedings of that day show to be intended by it? That the word *mandatum* should have been substituted; for it was, in fact, a domination, a command, which the Synod desired to assume over us; and if we ventured to disobey, we were to be visited with grievous pains and penalties. The gentleman had compared the Institution to a stage-coach, in which they (the Synod) had agreed to take their passage. Sir, I accept the simile: but what are the facts? Who built the coach? The inhabitants of Belfast and its neighbourhood have, with a spirit of liberality and patriotism which does them infinite credit, erected the Institution at an expense of nearly £20,000, from which they personally derive neither advantage nor profit. They have opened its doors for the education of Presbyterian Ulster; and what has Presbyterian Ulster contributed to its support? *Not a single hundred pounds from this whole Synod or its people*, with the exception, I believe, of *two congregations*. Now, Sir, when the proprietors of the coach had continued to run it on its original and fundamental principles, until by the exertion they had exhausted themselves, so that they were not able to purchase even grease for the wheels; then, Sir, and not till then, did this Synod step in and say, we will abandon you, unless you will consent to drive according to our views and our plans—nay, more, we will insist on having the whole management of the coach in our own hands! Sir, this management we will never give them—we will go on in amity and concord with them, if

they please, to carry on and promote the great object for which the establishment was founded; but our independence we will never surrender. I, Sir, for one, who have always in my official capacity, as a Visitor of the Institution, been an advocate for a close and cordial connexion with the Synod—who have always thought and spoken of this Synod with the highest respect, feel that the time is perhaps now come, when we may be called on to surrender our independence, or to forfeit our existence. I hesitate not—I prefer the latter part of the alternative—I will advocate it in my place as a proprietor, and I feel confident that I shall be backed and supported by the body of the proprietors. The Institution may fall, its ruin may be effected by the acts of this Synod; and if it perish, Fame will, no doubt, proclaim the fact to the world; but, Sir, Fame, we are told, has two trumpets, and I well know which she will employ to echo the deed."

Mr. Montgomery.—Moderator, I stand before you in a much more interested, I shall not say interesting, situation, than most of the gentlemen who have already addressed you. I appear before you in a threefold capacity, as a minister of this body, a member of Committee for examining the testimonials of candidates for the Moral Chair, and also as a proprietor of the Institution. If to these be added the official situation which I hold as a resident in the Institution, and the influence of that situation upon my prospects as the father of a large family, it will not appear strange that I should entertain strong feelings, when any attempt is made to injure a place with which I am so intimately connected. You will therefore pardon me, if I take the liberty of following the wandering observations of the gentlemen who spoke yesterday, and of giving free expression to the sentiments of my heart. I defy my opponents to show, that, in any one instance, I, or those who are in the habit of acting along with me in this house, have been the aggressors; but I hold, that it is not inconsistent with my sacred office, to give expression to an honest indignation; and that it is no way unworthy of a member of the church, to attempt to throw back the false and foul aspersions which were yesterday heaped upon the Institution. I believe, on the contrary, that I would be guilty of a positive dereliction of duty, were I not, in common with the feeblest reptile that creeps on the face of the earth, to act in conformity with the laws of self-preservation, and show that I participate in that spirit which pervades, not only human nature, but even the lower orders of creation.

It was stated by the gentleman who brought forward the resolutions, that he would have been very anxious to hear Dr. Wright's arguments for the original motion, though he thought it not likely that they would have converted him. I have little doubt that the Doctor would have found it extremely difficult to make a convert of the gentleman, for, if I am not very wrong informed, the condemnation of that Committee had been determined upon twenty-four hours previously. Now, such a manner of prejudging questions affecting the characters of individuals, may, perhaps, be very fair in the estimation of certain extraordinary men; but I will tell you how men of common understandings would have felt themselves bound to act. Instead of coming hastily to a conclusion, before they had examined evidence upon which to rest that conclusion, they would have given notice of their intention to investigate into the merits of the case; they would have waited until all the circumstances and all the testimony had been brought clearly before them, and then they would have endeavoured to form an impartial opinion. This would have appeared to be the natural and the honest course; but I was told, on good authority, and I can produce that authority, that the condemnation of your Committee had been determined upon, before "one jot or one tittle" of evidence had been submitted. But we are informed by the gentleman, that it is with the utmost reluctance, and pain, and

diffidence, he comes forward with a measure that may imply a censure upon the conduct of any individual! What an amiable gentleman this is! Witness his extreme candour in the manner in which he has prepared his resolutions! Witness his entire want of all pertinacity, when he urged upon the respectable deputation from the Institution, that the *whole* of the resolution of the Synod had not been recognised, as long as a syllable of it was omitted; when he defied any grammarian to say, upon the common laws of language, that "the resolution" did not mean every word of it; and that although he was told the *spirit* of it had been fully adopted, this could not satisfy him, because some of the words had been left out! His reluctance, too, was extreme, and his fear of injuring the feelings of others indescribable, when he made the most tremendous attack upon Dr. Thomson and the electors of the Institution, that was ever made on any men! And he smiled, too, so benignantly, when he was addressing this house! and I have been told that his smile was most majestic! and I can have no doubt of it. You have heard of the vampire sucking the life-blood of its sleeping victim, and flapping its wings over him, that his sleep may be prolonged till the work of death is completed. Mr. Cooke smiled, and the house seemed to hang upon the majestic smile; but the laugh was only the forerunner of the plunge of the dagger. I have been guilty of the crime of going to the theatre; and on one occasion I had an opportunity of witnessing the performance of John Kemble. I saw him in the character of Zanga, in the Revenge, when the dupe of his machinations lay stretched before him, and he stood upon his fallen victim, and smiled at his prostrate enemy. Such was the smile of the gentleman, when he thought he had triumphed over the Institution, and beheld it levelled to the dust. But who are these Managers of the Institution who have been assailed with such violence; who have been represented as little better than a pack of unprincipled scoundrels; who are prepared to abuse the deputed right of election, by allowing themselves to be influenced by private interest and religious prejudices, in opposition to the principles of the charter of the Institution, and their own solemn obligations? They are gentlemen of the very first respectability; of the highest moral and literary attainments; merchants, whose character stand high before the public; some of them arrived at the age of seventy, and whose names have never been sullied by a single disreputable action, until this foul stain has been attempted to be affixed to them. I shall not ask, who is the man that becomes their accuser. I shall not venture upon any comparison. He is an *orthodox* Minister. We have been told, that, *ceteris paribus*, the electors will always prefer an Arian Professor! This assertion rests not on the matter of fact, but is merely the vain imagination of the individual, for I shall call it by no other name. It has been contradicted in the most direct manner by Dr. Thomson; and it has been shown, that a Calvinist would be preferred, because he would be calculated to give more general satisfaction. But we have been reminded, for the tenth or twentieth time, of the election of Mr. Bruce; and it has been asserted, that the superior scholar was rejected, and the inferior chosen, merely because he was an Arian! Of Mr. Bryce's literary qualifications I entertain a very high opinion, and I never think of him but with respect. I am sorry that any comparison has been instituted between the two gentlemen, because I know it must be invidious; but let it be recollected, that the comparison has been forced upon me. I assert, then, that the alleged superiority is not founded in fact. Such a thing never was conceded, and it never can be conceded. The highest literary and classical authority that was present, when there was an opportunity of making a comparison, was decidedly in favour of Mr. Bruce's superiority as a scholar; and I can appeal to a Professor now present, whether there was not a division of opinion on the subject amongst the Faculty. I do not myself pretend to be eminently qualified

to judge on the subject; but I am at least able to form an opinion; and I have not the slightest hesitation in saying, that Mr. Bruce is the superior scholar. He may not have attempted to make so great a display of his information; but I say, that, as to the critical knowledge and powers of discrimination, there is not, in my mind, any ground of comparison. Let it be understood, also, that Mr. Bruce passed the most difficult examination, with the exception of that for a Fellowship, which is undergone in any college, when he succeeded in obtaining a scholarship in the University of Dublin. Why, then, will any one venture to depreciate the literary acquirements of that gentleman, and repeat to us for the tenth time, the same unfounded assertions? Equally unfounded is the assertion that he was put in by the Arians; he was put in by the Orthodox. It may appear strange to those who are not aware of the fact, and it is a subject which I choose to touch with delicacy, but I pledge myself to convince any one who will take the trouble of calling on me in private, that Mr. Bruce was put into the Institution by the highest theological influence in the Synod. Let it never, then, go abroad to the world, that he was appointed because he was an Arian; though he was elected in preference to Mr. Cooke's favourite candidate. *Hinc illæ lacrymæ.*

Mr. Ferrie, also, it seems, was elected merely because he was an Arian. Is there a shadow of evidence to prove this? Is there an item of proof to show that the Boards of Managers and Visitors had the slightest cognizance of his religious opinions, beyond the testimonials of which your own Committee approved? Had they not your own sanction for every thing they did? Your Committee had declared Mr. Ferrie eligible, and placed him immediately after a distinguished member of your own body. It was natural for them to conceive the candidate who stood next on the list was acknowledged to be superior, though courtesy would make the Committee put a member of the Synod at the head. I do not say this was a proper, but it was a very natural deduction. Under these circumstances, were they not bound to elect the man whom they believed to be the best qualified for the situation? But, supposing that the wish of the Synod had been more decidedly expressed, still you would have no just reason to complain. The Institution was not founded by the Synod; it was built by the contributions of all sects; and if there be a sect who contributed less to it than any other, it is the orthodox Presbyterians of Ulster. The fundamental principle of the Institution, is the election of Professors by a regard to their moral worth and literary attainments, without regard to peculiar religious opinions. You knew of this principle when you formed your connexion with the Institution. With both you and the public, the Managers and Visitors have kept their faith. You may break your faith with them; but you may rest satisfied, they will not break through a fundamental regulation, which has been recognised by the Government, and recommended by the Commissioners of Education Inquiry. They will not surrender to a sect, what was meant for all.

We have been told, however, that the exercise of this privilege was corrupt, and that the Managers and Visitors elected the inferior man on inferior testimonials. Ninety-nine out of a hundred in Presbyterian Ulster, it is said, would have given their suffrage to Mr. Carlile. This assertion would be worth some sort of attention, had Presbyterian Ulster seen the testimonials of the candidates; but as it is, without meaning any disrespect, I would say you might as well propose to poll the Caffres or the Hotentots. I am aware how invidious comparisons are; but the comparison has first been instituted, and is forced upon us by Mr. Cooke and by Mr. Carlile himself. Mr. Carlile has come forward with a chivalrous daring that would do honour to the days of Christian martyrdom. In coming forward to arraign the electors, he shows a hardihood which I admire, though I cannot imitate. He casts all personal feeling over-

board. He stands upon the deck, regardless of the conflicting elements of public opinion, and anxious only for the safety of the church. Mr. Cooke tells us, that Mr. Ferrie has scarcely any other testimonial than a round-robin from the College of Glasgow! I shall say nothing of the delicacy of this phrase applied to the Principal and eleven of the most distinguished Professors of Glasgow University. They have been alluded to in a manner which makes want of courtesy a minor matter of complaint. Signing their names in a round-robin, as if they were doing some act of infamy, is not the greatest charge brought against them. Five of these are Ministers of the Established Church of Scotland; sixteen other Ministers, including the late Dr. Taylor, of whom Mr. Cooke spoke so becomingly, together with Dr. Ranken, and others, have signed Mr. Ferrie's testimonials. And yet not one orthodox man has signed Mr. Ferrie's testimonials! This may be so; but I will give you evidence that they are orthodox; and, though I cannot produce two witnesses, here is one which has been useful to me on many occasions. In the speech which Mr. Cooke delivered last year in the Synod, and which has been published by authority, we have the following words:—

"The Church of Scotland has also been adduced as an example of the inutility of public confessions. We were told last year by a member of this house, who may be presumed to be well acquainted with the state of the Scottish Church, that it is infected with the disease of Arianism, or even Socinianism, to no inconsiderable amount; and is as much diversified in religious sentiment as we ourselves can possibly be. I cannot presume to speak of the Church of Scotland as matter of personal knowledge. Yet I know most of the Ministers of Edinburgh, either personally or by religious character; I have a similar acquaintance with many of the Ministers of Glasgow and its neighbourhood—and so far as my acquaintance extends, and it is not inconsiderable, I feel enabled to enter against the statement alluded to, my decided protest. I have no doubt the individual who made it, did honestly believe it; yet, I am bound, on the knowledge I have of the Church of Scotland, to say, I do not believe it."

It had been hinted by me, that heresy prevailed to a considerable extent in the Church of Scotland, hedged in as she is by creeds and confessions. You see with what orthodox zeal Mr. Cooke here denies my assertion. But now, when a different purpose is to be served, he insinuates the heterodoxy of the Glasgow Professors who signed Mr. Ferrie's testimonials, by showing that there is not one of the whole phalanx of orthodoxy amongst them. He is not content with insinuations; he broadly asserts, that no orthodox individuals certified for Mr. Ferrie. Against this assertion, I will give you another testimony, if possible still more convincing. In the evidence given by Mr. Cooke, before the Commissioners of Education, we have the following:—

"Do you conceive there are at present any preachers in Glasgow who avow and inculcate Arian principles?—I never knew of any.

"Never, at any time?—No.

"Do you believe there is at present any preacher at Glasgow, who, by his silence upon certain points of Christianity, would leave you as little dubious, as by the direct inculcation of his opinions, that he maintained Arian principles?—I have reason to suspect there is one such in Glasgow; but I should not say whether Arian or Socinian; I am rather inclined to suspect Socinian; but as to any overt act or declaration, I never knew any on the part of any preacher now in Glasgow. There was a Socinian preacher there some years ago, but I think he has removed from it. I consider Glasgow unpropitious for the growth of either Arianism or Socinianism.

"Are we to understand there is no avowed Arian minister in Glasgow?—Not that I know of, or with the exception mentioned, ever heard of; if there be any, their character must be very obscure.

"Is there any considerable number of avowed Arians in Glasgow?—There may be some; but I do not know any thing of them. I never heard Arians mentioned as a prominent or even existing party; I knew of some Socinians who at one time had a preacher there; I believe they have no preacher now."

Here we have it sworn by Mr. Cooke, on the Holy Evangelists, not only that there are no preachers in Glasgow who inculcate Arian principles, but that there are none who by their silence would give suspicion of their orthodoxy. I give you no private testimony—no hearsay whisperings. If he has sworn the truth, he has no right to cast even the shadow of a doubt upon the orthodoxy of the Ministers who have certified for Mr. Ferrie. I will give you a little more. [Mr. Montgomery read some other extracts to the same effect.] It may easily be seen, how well this testimony answered the purpose at the time it was given. The object *then*, was to show how much safer the students would be in Glasgow than in Belfast. The Professors and Preachers, nay, the very air of the place, was favourable to orthodoxy; but *now* they are all a knot of heterodox round-robiners! This looks like a man who can blow hot and cold out of the same mouth; though I cannot, with decorum, lay any such charge against a clergyman. Mr. Carlile also has his testimonials. He has published them—not before the election, but after it was over—not for the information of the electors, but to show to the world what a treasure had been lost to the Institution! But among these there is not the name of a single individual who taught him or helped him to an idea. He has not even a round-robin from Glasgow College. He has not a particle of testimony to his orthodoxy from Dr. Macgill or Dr. Chalmers, or any of the others, for the want of which Mr. Ferrie is charged with being heterodox. According to Mr. Cooke's opinion, here is a want greater than all the abundance; and, were I inclined to draw inferences from silence, I would say it strengthens an opinion which I have formed from Mr. Carlile's writings, that he is no more a believer in the Trinity than I am. The signatures to Mr. Carlile's testimonials are twenty-three in all, including a round-robin of respectable members of the synod of Ulster. It was very important, no doubt, to put the name of the Archbishop of Dublin first. But what is the testimony of his Grace respecting Mr. Carlile's qualifications? Why, just that he knows nothing of Mr. Carlile personally. He merely states what he has heard of him. He gives a testimonial to his literary character, couched in such terms as I would scarcely use were I giving a certificate of character to a servant with whom I had parted on bad terms—[cries of read, read. Mr. M. here read the testimonial of his Grace.] There is another from the Archbishop of Tuam, equally vague and indefinite. I need not read the one from Dr. Sadlier. I do not speak thus of Mr. Carlile's testimonials, to depreciate his literary character, which stands deservedly high in public estimation. I do not say that he is not qualified to fill the Moral Philosophy Chair. I speak thus because it has been asserted that the electors chose the inferior candidate, in defiance of the most convincing testimony of the superior qualifications of the man they rejected. If the comparison be invidious, we have, as I have said, been compelled to make it, that we may defend our integrity; and I feel no hesitation in saying, that with my views of the comparative merits of the two candidates, I would have been ashamed had I given my vote otherwise than I did give it. It has been again and again stated, that Mr. Carlile was rejected because he was the candidate supported by the Synod. I firmly believe that he was rejected on no such grounds. His being an orthodox member of the Synod did not injure him. He may have been injured by Dublin gossip. The electors may have heard something with regard to his temper, which might lower their estimation of his fitness to be a Professor of Moral Philosophy; or some of

them may have received an impression from personal observation, not favourable to his assiduity. Mr. Carlile, on one occasion, preached a charity sermon in Belfast, for the Fever Hospital. Some individuals thought he did not do justice to the subject. It was evident, they said, that he came unprepared; and they afterwards said, they feared that a man who would come unprepared after a special request being made to him, to preach for a public charity, might prove a negligent and indolent professor. These surmises were made by some, and they may have influenced the opinion of the individuals who entertained them; but the existence of them afforded no ground for impugning the integrity of the electors, or impeaching the purity of their motives. I know one who told me, that it cost him two sleepless nights, as he wavered between his desire to vote for Mr. Carlile, for the sake of personal friendship, and a conviction that he was bound to vote for Mr. Ferrie, whom, in his conscience, he believed to be the superior candidate. The electors are not solitary in the castigation they have received. By way of variety, the Committee have been made to suffer collectively and individually. Mr. Cooke made a tremendous attack on Mr. Wauchope, because he believed Mr. Ferrie to be orthodox, from his having subscribed the Westminster Confession of Faith; and we heard a great deal about Judas Iscariot, and were favoured with the candid and fair and charitable insinuations which these words can convey. I had hinted, it seems, that Mr. Ferrie might be an Arminian. The Committee are forthwith involved in a dilemma! If Mr. Ferrie was an Arminian, and had signed the Westminster Confession, he must be a rogue, as no one but a Calvinist could sign such a creed; and no Arminian could be considered in that light. So says Mr. Cooke, *now;* but I call forward my witnesses again. In his evidence before the Commissioners, page 147, we have the following:—

"In point of fact, would the condition of the subscription to the Confession of Westminster, have the effect of excluding Arians altogether from the ministry?—Yes, it must.

"No person could subscribe that confession, and be an Arian?—No, he could not; it is impossible he could be any thing but a Calvinist; it is beyond all question, the most strict of all Confessions that have been written."

Observe here: it is not merely said that no Arian could sign the Westminster Confession; but that no one but a Calvinist could sign it. "*It is impossible he could be any thing but a Calvinist.*" And yet Mr. Wauchope is to be sneered at, because he relied on the man who had subscribed to this Confession, and whose soundness in the faith was certified by men who had signed this Confession! Mr. Ferrie may since have changed his views, and yet not deserve the cognomen of Judas Iscariot; but how was Mr. Wauchope to know this?—The Principal and Professors of Glasgow College, and the Ministers of the Established Church of Scotland, who signed Mr. Ferrie's testimonials, may be all heterodox, as Mr. Cooke has not only insinuated, but also roundly asserted. But how was Mr. Wauchope, or the Committee, in blame for believing the evidence brought before them? But then I hinted Mr. Ferrie *might* be an Arminian, and this should have excited, in the minds of the Committee, a suspicion of his heterodoxy! But what says the witness? In the Appendix to the Fourth Report of the Commissioners, is the test which Mr. Cooke deemed expedient should be signed by the different Professors of the Belfast Academical Institution. It consists of ten articles; five more in number than the five points of Calvinism. Mark the following questions, and the answers given by Mr. Cooke:—

"But still you think an Arminian Presbyterian and a Calvinistic Presbyterian could sign it?—So I conceive; Calvinism fairly understood and correctly explained, I take to be the doctrine of the Bible; but Arminianism, as generally taught in modern times, seems to me to concede

every point essential to Calvinism. I have, on another occasion, stated to this Board, that I considered there was a marked distinction between the primitive Arminians, called Remonstrants in Holland, and those who in modern times are called Arminians in these countries. The primitive Arminians taught a great deal of Pelagianism; the modern Arminians generally teach as much Calvinism. The doctrine of original sin, of the necessary priority of divine grace in conversion, and of justification by faith alone, appear to me to concede Calvinism by consequence, in all its essentials."

Now, if modern Arminianism "concedes every point essential to Calvinism," why should my hinting that Mr. Ferrie might be an Arminian, be a proof of his heterodoxy? Even if I had directly said—nay, shown proof that he was an Arminian, why should the Committee be blamed for holding opinions to be orthodox, which, Mr. Cooke says, "concede Calvinism by consequence in all its essentials?" It answered Mr. Cooke's purpose to assert in 1825, that signing the Westminster Confession would exclude from the Ministry every man but the Calvinist. It now serves his purpose to insinuate, what I do not controvert, that men may change their opinions—that subscription does not preserve the purity of the Church of Scotland—and to talk about Judas Iscariot—and to lead us to believe, that the Committee should be censured for supposing it possible an Arminian could be orthodox—the very thing that is sworn to be quite practicable in the evidence which I have read. Mr. Cooke has pressed forward another statement, intended to involve myself in a contradiction. Those who have often rolled in the mire cannot bear to see their neighbours with unsoiled coats. It has been stated by a respectable elder, that I said in the Committee, speaking of Mr. Ferrie, "I believe he is not what *you* call orthodox, nor what *I* would call orthodox." The former part of this sentence I did say—the latter part I did not. In fact, to have done so, would have defeated the object which I am represented as having in view. If I wished to impress the Committee with the idea that Mr. Ferrie was orthodox, it would be a strange oversight to add the latter clause of the sentence.

I now come to that part of Mr. Cooke's speech, in which he says, the silence of Mr. Ferrie's testimonials respecting his orthodoxy, should have alarmed and raised the doubts of the Committee. We heard this silence compared to a voice from the grave, which should have spoken trumpet-tongued in our ears. In one respect, I grant, it may now give us a warning. It shows us the fearful interpretation which can be put upon silence, and the opportunity it affords for throwing the vilest imputations on the character of an absent man. The character of an absent man, has been treated in a manner unparalleled in the history of any court. The direct attack, the invidious insinuation, the bitter jibe, and the atrocious calumny, have all been employed to effect his ruin. But what silence is there in Mr. Ferrie's testimonials, that was not in those of all who had been previously elected? There was the same silence in the testimonials of Dr. Young. In fact, it is only of late years that peculiar views of theology have been considered as the best passports to literary eminence, and all worldly emoluments. Sound orthodoxy is every thing; genuine piety and rational religion are terms of reproach; and extensive learning, pure philosophy, and splendid talents, are nothing more than inferior attainments. And what is this orthodoxy, which is to be the essential if not the sole recommendation to the Moral Philosophy Chair of the Institution? It is something, which, by the very laws of the Institution, the Professor is bound not to inculcate on his students. The act and compact which he has sanctioned, prevent him from directly or indirectly interfering with the religious sentiments of the students. Mr. Cooke has shown how the heterodox Professor may evade his obligation. Of the orthodox man of probity I entertain no such opinion; and I am

firmly convinced, this essential qualification for the Moral Philosophy Chair, so far as regards his students, can only be like a light, useless and unseen. If there be silence to be blamed, it is the silence of Mr. Cooke himself. He knew Mr. Ferrie to be an Arian, or a Socinian, or a Neologist, or something which was not one of these, but a thing more dreadful than any. He saw how matters stood; yet he did not warn the electors. He concealed what he knew even from the Synod's Committee. He did not stand forward and raise his voice, as he did when Mr. Bryce was a candidate. He looked on, though he saw the electors approaching the verge of a precipice, and yet he would not put forth even his little finger to prevent them from taking the awful plunge. And now when they are fallen, he mingles his triumph with insult. He charges the Managers and Visitors of the Institution with ingratitude—the lowest grade of depravity and meanness—a vice so vile that no one can be found who would acknowledge himself guilty of it. Were the Managers and Visitors ungrateful, when at an expense of £20,000 they established a seminary, which brought education home to your doors? Did the Institution prove itself ungrateful, when it was offered the patronage of Government, and unlimited wealth, if it would break its connection with you? Did the Institution prove itself ungrateful, when it preferred struggling through all the difficulties in which its fidelity to you involved it, to the patronage of power and the smiles of a court? Or, is it the Synod that has been ungrateful? For seven years, the Institution has been struggling with difficulty through its devotedness to you; and instead of cheering and supporting, you have been straining every nerve to injure it. Like the serpents that came out of the sea, and entwined round the body of Laocoon, you have wreathed your strangulating folds around the Belfast Institution, and now you are hissing over its head. But still, forsooth, the Managers and Visitors must be charged with ingratitude, because they did not elect the candidate you set forward! Does gratitude mean the sacrifice of honesty? Does it imply, that men should forfeit their integrity? Does it imply, that the elector shall vote just as you suggest? Does it imply, that because you gave up a power, which never should have been granted, and which never will be recognised—that men are therefore to surrender their consciences? If this be the price at which your friendship is to be obtained, it is too dear—it never will be paid. Even were it a debt of gratitude, it would be a crime to discharge it. But I tell you, I will speak plainly, and I care not how it will be received, for it is the truth—I tell you, that the obligation is all upon the one side. The Institution is a seminary which has dealt liberally with all, and particularly with the sons of Presbyterian ministers. I ask you, how your sons were received into it? I ask you to do justice to your own honest feelings, and repeat what you have frequently acknowledged, and give expression to those sentiments, which the heart of a parent will dictate, and say, how your children have been treated at that seminary which you are called on to subvert, and with what hospitality they have been received into the bosom of the families of the very men upon whose conduct you are asked to affix the stigma of reproach? And what is this mighty concession which you have made, and of which Mr. Cooke boasts, when he says that you were the masters of the Institution, and had your feet upon the necks of its Managers and Visitors? Let us be plain; it is best to be so. You conceded a right, which, as I have said, never would have been recognised. The influential members of your body had meetings. It was known to them, that the Institution never would accede to the terms proposed, when the Government grant was offered. It was known to them, that the men who had been instrumental in founding it, would rather see it levelled with the ground, than see the property of the public made the prize of a party; and that which was meant for the world, made the slave of a sect. The Synod knew

this, and they knew that if they made no compromise, their Professor's salary would be lost. It was then that some who will claim praise for their moderation—nay, who in proud humility will lament their too easy good nature, gave up a shadow for what they hoped would be a substance—they gave up the *veto*, which never would have been acknowledged, for their *avisamentum*, which, coming in its insidious shape, would readily be received. They could not storm the citadel—for it was defended by men who would not surrender their integrity; but they would send forth a flag of truce, and they would get within the walls in the guise of friendship, and grasp upon the first favourable opportunity of seizing by stratagem what they could not obtain by force. This is the light in which the world will view your conduct, if you persist. They will say, that you wished to acquire indirectly the power which you could not obtain, nor even attempt to obtain, without odium. They will say, that though you affected to disclaim a *veto* over the Institution, you become frantic when your slightest hint is disregarded. They will say, that you wished to put into its chairs the influential members of your body, and make its offices and emoluments an appendage to the Synod of Ulster. The conduct which is proposed to be pursued towards the Belfast Institution, is such as the honest feelings of the world never would sanction. Its prejudices must, therefore, be pressed into the service. The Institution must be represented as being tainted with Arianism, and Arianism must be depicted in the most disgusting colours. It is for this reason that we have heard Arianism resolved into a thousand similes, equally correct, equally courteous, and equally Christian! First, it was a soul-destroying leprosy—and then, it became a house, and required to be white-washed, I suppose, by the great Master Mason!—and then it turned into the waters of Sodom, and then it became "Dead Sea fruits, that change into ashes!" and then—but it is useless to proceed. It was variable as Proteus himself, and in every form, equally odious! And what are we who are thus attacked through our opinions? Are we liars, or false accusers, or unkind husbands, or negligent fathers, or unfaithful pastors, or bad neighbours? Or, what are our accusers, or in what does nature give a superior impress to their understanding? In external form we differ not much from our brethren of mankind. Has the Almighty set the seal of his displeasure on the countenance of my friend on my right (Mr. Porter), or has he given any peculiar dignity to Mr. Cooke, that he should speak so hardly of us? I have been told by some of that gentleman's admirers, that when he smiles, his smile is angelic. I am not disposed to dispute this; but when the Almighty has affixed no outward mark of his displeasure on any of his creatures for belonging to a peculiar sect—when he has given us—as I praise and bless his name that he has—kind friends and affectionate flocks; when he is pleased not only to bear with our infirmities, but to bless and prosper our labours, why should a puny fellow mortal stigmatise our opinions, and liken them to the disgusting leprosy, and the envenomed poison, and the fearful contagion? Why should weak, erring, blind, ignorant, and fallible man, judge so harshly of his brother, when he knows that we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ? Before that tribunal I hope to appear. By Him, who is the great King and Head of his Church, I look forward to be judged; but before the tribunal of no other will I stand. But leaving those figurative expressions, which have been so charitably applied to Arianism, what is the real, the substantial danger which you dread from the Belfast Institution? Orthodoxy must be a very tender plant, if it must be so sheltered, and shaded, and pampered. The religion which was first promulgated by a few poor fishermen, and went forth conquering and to conquer, required no such adventitious aids; and when an inspired writer has said, "try all things, prove all things," poor, indeed, is the compliment you pay

to your opinions, when you say, that if any others are thrown in the way of the inquiring mind, your tenets will be forsaken. I never would condemn a system of belief for the practice of those who profess it; but there are cases in which we may judge of the opinion by the practice. What, I ask, has been the practice of the loudest shouters among those who have denounced the Institution as a den of Arians? Have they not sent their own sons to repose under the *Upas* tree—breathe the infected air—to drink of the waters of Sodom, and to eat of the Dead Sea fruits? Can the world believe men to be in earnest, when their practice is so opposed to their profession? And what credit is due to this overweening anxiety for the spiritual welfare of the rising generation, when the very men who express it, expose those who are nearest and dearest, to the danger which they warn others to avoid? Why do not the enemies of the Institution lay aside their metaphors, and speak plainly at once? They say, we will have "no chaff;" we must have the solid corn. Go on, then, if you wish to follow where they lead. Reap where you have not sown, and gather where you have not strewed—make the Institution your own—drive out every man, no matter how high may be his literary attainments, if he will not bow to your mandate! But this you cannot do. There are men who have the management of the Institution, who would rather see it levelled with the ground than made a citadel of sectarian bitterness. You may injure—you may destroy it;—you may ruin a seminary which promises to be a blessing to the country—where the rising generation may meet, and drink from the pure fountain of knowledge, and, as they look on each other's faces, imbibe principles of forbearance, and affection, and kindness, before the unfortunate political and religious dissensions which exist in this country have estranged them from each other. You may ruin the Belfast Institution, but the infamy of the deed will descend upon the heads, and brand the memory of those who made a waste, where they could not establish their usurpation. I speak warmly—but I cannot help it. I am ill in health; but, though I should lie down, when I have done, upon the bed from which I was never to rise, I must give vent to the feelings of my heart.

We have been told of a very active canvass having been carried on. Now, the plain truth is, that the exertions were not confined to one side; and that whatever Mr. Carlile may have done himself, his friends were by no means idle. I could mention the agent of a very influential nobleman, who had been applied to on the subject. This I think all fair, and I mention it with no other object than to confirm what I have stated. But the electors are charged with being directed by another influence. Mercantile speculations, narrow calculations of base gain, are said to have directed them in their choice. With most of these gentlemen I am intimately acquainted; and I assert, that it is not possible to point out any men more truly respectable. I have been lately in England, and I know that in that country the merchants of Belfast are regarded as standing at the very head of their profession; and yet these are the men who are charged, as if they were a set of peddling shopkeepers, of selling their consciences for filthy lucre. But why need we wonder that the Belfast merchants should have been subjected to such foul slander, when even the Professors of the University of Glasgow are not allowed to escape? Mr. Carlile stated that they have a direct pecuniary interest in putting down the Institution. Now, I just ask against what body of men is this charge preferred? A body of men, whose character and talents are calculated to place them among the very first literary characters in the world, are charged with the degrading crime of attempting to put down a seminary, with the prospect of a trifling pecuniary gain. The very love of learning, if they are not worse than the beasts of the field, would make them anxious not only to see a seminary in Belfast, but to see numberless other similar places of education flourishing over the world.

But if they have the heads, or the hearts of honest independent men, they will call upon the man who ventured to make the statement, to account for the rash charge at some other bar than this. Oh, is it possible that they could be guilty of entertaining such an idea for one moment? I appeal to those in this house who have drunk at the fountain of knowledge, under the care of that most admirable man, Professor Milne, if such a statement can gain any credit in this place; that individual who was the first to lead the mind of the student to form habits of thought. I speak with peculiar ideas of veneration of that man, for I believe that it was in his class that my mind was first taught to think; and that, under God, I owe mainly to him whatever strength of character I possess, and whatever name and reputation I may have in the world. I know that many who hear me could echo the sentiments which I have now expressed. It is painful to hear it stated that such a man would wish to injure a place of public education, to sink a literary establishment, in order to pocket sixty or seventy pounds a-year! If he were base enough to entertain the idea, and could look forward to a long period of life, he might have hopes of enjoying the benefits of such a plan; but, in the course of nature, that venerable septuagenarian—that man of seventy, must retire from the busy, bustling stage of life, long before Mr. Ferrie could do any evil to the Institution. He has been charged with paying marked attention to Mr. Yates, when a student in his class—of introducing him to his friends, and showing them his essays. Now, in all this, there is nothing extraordinary. Mr. Yates was a young man of high promise, and his character in the world has proved the accuracy of the opinion formed of him in his youth. Although I differ as much from the opinions which he holds, as from those of his great antagonist Dr. Wardlaw, yet I cannot but admire the talents which he has displayed in that celebrated controversy. The attention paid to this distinguished student, and son of an English minister, may be easily explained by considering the kindness of Professor Milne's heart, and his admiration of genius; but it would not do to take a plain and obvious motive which lay at hand upon the surface. The gentleman must dive for one into the mud, and ascribe the circumstance to a desire to propagate Socinianism!

An attack has been made upon Mr. Ferrie, because he is stated to be a rational preacher. It appears extraordinary that the truths of the Gospel should not be considered rational; and one would almost suspect that this had been intended as a side-stroke at his own party. There was one part of the attack with which I was greatly distressed. Not content with laying charges against Mr. Ferrie as a preacher, he turns round to misrepresent the New-Light preachers of this country, alleging that they never refer in their public services to heaven or hell, to sin or punishment, to eternity or judgment. I need scarcely wonder at this, for Mr. Carlile has published a chapter in his book, nearly as charitable as this. Now, I say, wherever such statements are made, whether in a printed book, or in an unpremeditated speech, they must proceed either from inconceivable ignorance, or from wilful misrepresentation. If there be any ministers more likely than others to inculcate these doctrines, they are unquestionably those denominated New-Light. Our own people, who know our ministry, and who are acquainted with our private walk and conversation, know the falsehood of such charges; but, in this age of party rancour and strong prejudice, such groundless assertions are greedily grasped at. Reports, however vague, are readily taken up, to the injury of those whose doctrines and conduct are misrepresented; but I do beseech and charge you, unless you wish to blast our reputation, to sow dissension in our congregations, and leave our families without support, not to malign us by unworthy and undeserved aspersions. If I were to judge of Calvinism from what I heard yesterday in this house, and from what I have frequently heard elsewhere, I might be ready to

charge against it as much unchristian virus as could be ascribed to any other system; but I feel that it would be unjust to charge against a system what is only the fault of the individuals. I blame not the system; I blame the heart of man which is "deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked." There are some peculiar opinions of Calvinism, which, when misunderstood, may be injurious; but with the well-informed can have no bad tendency. Some of my best and dearest friends are Calvinists. There is a man in this house, and my heart almost prompts me to lay my hand on his shoulder—he is a Calvinist, and I believe that God never made a more upright man, or one more estimable in all the relations of life. Shall I then condemn the opinions from which I dissent, as if they were chargeable with what I know to arise from the ebullition of evil passions? No. Though my brethren will not let me hold communion with them, I am still ready to stretch out to them the right hand of fellowship. I trust, when we have laid aside the garb of frail mortality, we shall meet in that better and happier world, wondering at our own sinful folly, in having disputed and excited strife, where all should have been harmony and love. I am weary of this contest which has been continued from year to year. If we cannot live in peace with you—at all hazards, we will leave you. I will not continue in a state of constant turmoil with my brethren. I have human passions and frailties, and sometimes I cannot control my temper when my principles are misrepresented, and the Institution with which I am connected, is assailed through my person. But if I know the rock on which I have once suffered shipwreck, it is my own fault if I am cast upon it again. If we cannot live together in peace, in the name of God, let us part in peace. For myself, I have no fear as to consequences. My people know my opinions; and I have no doubt of their faithfulness and affection. Some of my brethren may be injured; but he that catereth for the sparrow, will not let the children of the sufferer for conscience sake, come to want. The cause of God and truth will finally prevail; and though I cannot approve of the individuals who excited them, I feel convinced that the storms which have raged among us, will purify the Church, and have their result in the triumph of those opinions which I believe in my conscience to be true.

We have no room for Mr. Cooke's reply, nor is it necessary to be given, as no facts were elicited by it. But in the course of the meeting, a Mr. Stein, a student at Glasgow College, and the Rev. Dr. Burns of Paisley, were examined as to Mr. Ferrie's "orthodoxy!" and curious evidence it was: Mr. Stein declaring, that he judged by analogy as to the soundness of Mr. Ferrie's discourses, because he "sometimes in the evenings heard Mr. Harris, and others of similar sentiments, and in this way formed his opinion;" and Dr. Burns averring, "that in Scotland the terms Arian and Socinian are unknown—the general phrase is, anti-evangelical!" At length a Committee was appointed to confer with the Managers of the Belfast Institution, to report to a special meeting of the Synod to be convened at Cookstown on the second Tuesday in August. And at the same meeting will come on the discussion respecting the separation of the Arians from the Synod. May the friends of liberty be firm and united; may they be honest in the expression of their opinions; may they have the Christian virtue to act according to their convictions.

JAMES HEDDERWICK AND SON, PRINTERS, GLASGOW.

Pac Q mid Sch 77.

GTU Library
3 2400 00269 7948